

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
Bulletin

Volume 31

Autumn 1945

Number 3

Editor

Ralph E. Himstead

Editorial Committee

Edward C. Kirkland

Louise Pound

Robert P. Ludlum

Richard J. Purcell

Publication Office: 20th and Northampton Streets, Easton, Pa.

Editorial Office: 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Issued quarterly: Spring (March), Summer (June), Autumn (September), and Winter (December). Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions including Canada are \$3.50 a year.

Entered as second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

PRESIDENT

QUINCY WRIGHT (*International Law*) University of Chicago

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

FRANK L. GRIFFIN (*Mathematics*) Reed College

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

JEWELL HUGHES BUSHEY (*Mathematics*) Hunter College

GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD (*Government, Law*) Washington Office

ASSOCIATE SECRETARY

ROBERT P. LUDLUM (*History, Government*) Washington Office

TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

TERM MEMBERS

1943-1945

GEORGE B. FRANKLIN (<i>English</i>)	Boston University
FRANK E. E. GERMANN (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Colorado
THOMAS FITZGERALD GREEN, JR. (<i>Law</i>)	University of Georgia
E. W. McDIARMID (<i>Library Science</i>)	University of Minnesota
MAX MASON (<i>Mathematical Physics</i>)	California Institute of Technology
A. S. MERRILL (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Montana State University
LUCIUS GASTON MOFFATT (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	University of Virginia
FRANCIS EARL RAY (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Cincinnati
MARY H. SWINDLER (<i>Classical Archaeology</i>)	Bryn Mawr College
H. VAN RENSSELAER WILSON (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Brooklyn College

1944-1946

DONALD W. DAVIS (<i>Biology</i>)	College of William and Mary
WILLIAM JAFFÉ (<i>Economics</i>)	Northwestern University
I. L. KANDEL (<i>Education</i>)	Columbia University
JOHN KUIPER (<i>Philosophy</i>)	University of Kentucky
CLAIR FRANCIS LITTELL (<i>History, Political Science</i>)	Cornell College
RALPH H. LUTZ (<i>History</i>)	Stanford University
WARREN O. NELSON (<i>Anatomy</i>)	State University of Iowa
OTTIS H. RECHARD (<i>Mathematics</i>)	University of Wyoming
RICHARD H. SHRYOCK (<i>American History</i>)	University of Pennsylvania
ROBERT WITHINGTON (<i>English</i>)	Smith College

1945-1947

C. E. AYRES (<i>Economics</i>)	University of Texas
HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD (<i>Sociology</i>)	New York University
WILLIAM NORCROSS FELT (<i>Modern Languages</i>)	Denison University
RALPH F. FUCHS (<i>Law</i>)	Washington University
STANLEY E. HARTSELL (<i>Bacteriology</i>)	Purdue University
ARTHUR C. HICKS (<i>English</i>)	Western Washington College of Education
HAROLD NEWTON LEE (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Tulane University
HOWARD P. STABLER (<i>Physics</i>)	Williams College
CLAIR WILCOX (<i>Economics</i>)	Swarthmore College
A. E. ZUCKER (<i>German and Comparative Literature</i>)	University of Maryland

FORMER PRESIDENTS

A. J. CARLSON (<i>Physiology</i>)	University of Chicago
FREDERICK S. DEIBLER (<i>Economics</i>)	Northwestern University
W. T. LAPRADE (<i>History</i>)	Duke University

CONTENTS

THE RECRUITMENT OF QUALIFIED TEACHERS—HIGHER EDUCATION'S GREATEST POSTWAR NEED, <i>Willard Wilson</i>	337
A LIBERAL EDUCATION, <i>C. Judson Herrick</i>	348
FORCES THAT HAVE SHAPED DOCTORAL WORK, <i>Ernest V. Hollis</i>	357
THE EXTRA-CURRICULUM AS AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION, <i>Julian L. Woodward</i>	383
COLLECTIVE LIFE INSURANCE, <i>Rainard B. Robbins</i>	392
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN FACULTY PROPOSAL ON SALARIES, <i>James K. Pollock</i>	400
A MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHER REPLIES, <i>Mario A. Pei</i> ...	409
IS CONSOLATION OF THE INTELLECTUAL POSSIBLE? <i>Mary L. Coolidge</i>	418
EDUCATION FOR FELLOWSHIP, <i>W. E. Howland</i>	424
THE WARTIME AREA AND LANGUAGE COURSES, <i>Charles S. Hyneman</i>	434
TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF WAR, <i>Llewellyn Gross</i>	448
WHY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS WEAR OUT, <i>Hiram Haydn</i>	455
CONCERNING THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.....	462
EDUCATION AND THE PEACE, <i>Ralph E. Himstead</i>	466
EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR NORWEGIAN STUDENTS.....	507
REPORT OF THE 1945 NOMINATING COMMITTEE.....	509
ASSOCIATION NEWS.....	515
CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....	520
MEMBERSHIP.....	521
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	530

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

Contributors to This Issue

MARY L. COOLIDGE is Professor of Philosophy at Wellesley College.

LLEWELLYN GROSS is Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Buffalo.

HIRAM HAYDN is Secretary of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa and Editor of the *American Scholar*.

C. JUDSON HERRICK is Professor Emeritus of Neurology of the University of Chicago.

ERNEST V. HOLLIS is Principal Specialist in Higher Education of the U. S. Office of Education.

W. E. HOWLAND is Professor of Sanitary Engineering at Purdue University.

CHARLES S. HYNEMAN is Professor of Government and Director of Government Research of Louisiana State University (on leave of absence in government service).

MARIO A. PEI is Assistant Professor of Romance Languages at Columbia University.

JAMES K. POLLOCK is Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan.

RAINARD B. ROBBINS is Vice-President of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association.

WILLARD WILSON is Chairman of the Department of English of the University of Hawaii.

JULIAN L. WOODWARD is Associate Professor of Sociology at Cornell University.

THE RECRUITMENT OF QUALIFIED TEACHERS—HIGHER EDUCATION'S GREATEST POSTWAR NEED

By WILLARD WILSON

University of Hawaii

An Army colonel, head of a very large section of a wartime agency in Washington, recently said to me, "One thing that interests me and somewhat alarms me is the thing that is happening to the young men that we have called from college jobs. They're all getting 'big' ideas."

"What do you mean 'big'?" I asked somewhat truculently.

"Well—I mean now we are beginning to taper off our work, and they don't want to go back to their college jobs. They've been making good salaries, often twice what their old jobs paid, and they have an idea they can do all right in business."

"Can they?"

"Certainly. All of these fellows are smart or I wouldn't have picked them. They've done marvelous jobs, and they'll make out all right. I'm not worried about them—I'm worried about the colleges. These are the fellows who ought to be teaching my kids Freshman English and Psychology and Science ten years from now. And hardly one of them plans to go back to teaching. They've lost their awe of the business world, some plan to stay with the services, and it's going to raise hell with the colleges so far as the future is concerned."

Being not so young as I once was, and very much more philosophical, I was inclined to agree with his statement of what had happened, although not entirely with his despairing view of the future. The colleges right now realize that they are not getting the virile, masculine, and balanced crop of young instructors that they had culled over in such a high-handed way before the war. The reason for it is, of course, obvious.

But the point that has escaped many academic planners, in their present harried concern with curriculum for returning soldiers and probable depreciation of endowments in an inflated economy, is that they are not going to have a qualitatively adequate teaching staff after the war. A rather bitter and brutal statement, but one nevertheless having more than a grain of truth in it, was that of a college dean to whom I talked almost a year ago: "Our most promising young male teachers have gone into either war or government, and our graduate candidates are either 4-F's or women. Frankly we are not optimistic about the effect on our faculty of the four or five year gap in our normal teacher acquisitions."

In many ways I think he was too pessimistic—especially as regards the permanent harm done to the teaching profession. War obviously has done things to the teaching profession both good and bad. On the good side it has shaken some of us out of our snobbish complacency and self-righteousness and broadened our conception of what education must do if it is to fulfill our oft-parroted aim of "preparing the student to live." On the bad side it has jarred many of the younger members of the profession into such a sharp and sudden realization of the inequitable treatment accorded simon-pure teachers in this "mechanik" age that we are in grave danger of losing the cream of our crop. The loss will be felt the greatest probably about 15 to 25 years from now, unless we do something and do it fast.

I can best establish a basis for what I want to say by outlining briefly, and with some camouflaging of identifying data, the cases of several young people whom I know well.

1. Elbert Barth is a young man from a good family, intelligent and with a scholarly bent. He had been an instructor for a couple of years after his M.A. He was not brilliant, but had the inner gentleness needed by a teacher and a sound appreciation of values. Actually, his is the ideal temperament for a professor: adventurous intellectually, but circumspect and conventional in public deportment. He went back to his University for a year's work on his doctorate and made excellent progress, cleared his preliminaries and got the research for his dissertation well under way. Needing money, he returned to his job and taught for another year very successfully, although at the same rank and pay. In the middle of the next year the Japanese hit Pearl Harbor and within a few

weeks Barth was commissioned in the Navy. He is now a seasoned full lieutenant, has seen action in a very responsible position of combat intelligence work. He has married a charming and ambitious wife, has met hundreds of new people, and has been made to feel—more than his academic employer ever made him feel—that he is appreciated for his mature abilities. I have talked with him recently, and he now feels that he (a) will not be able to take time out to get his degree after the war, and (b) would not be able to adjust himself to the sharp cut in salary a return to academic life would entail. He is now seriously considering a Navy career as a permanent thing, though his real inclination is still toward college work.

2. Fred Judson is a slightly younger man, with no experience as a teacher, but with a scholarly inclination and a poetic mind. Shortly after taking his A.B. he was inducted into the Marine Corps, but not before he had published two sensitive though slender little books. He is a good Marine flier—but he has every inclination toward teaching, and high qualifications for it if given a chance. He is not even started on graduate work, however, and he will probably be around 28 years of age when he gets out—with all the backlog of desires for material living that several years of existence on Pacific atolls will engender. A rigid insistence on academic routine may turn him away in disgust after the war, and probably result in his making a frustrated success in business.

3. Karl Jensen is a 45-year-old mathematician who was a solid and valuable member of a university staff when the Navy pulled him into uniform as a senior lieutenant. He has for some time now been a full Commander, and is well worth his three stripes. He is set either way, if he stays in the service or returns to academic life where he will be badly needed after the war; but on the whole the Navy is in a position to make the best offer in every way except one—that feeling that every teacher has of molding lives usefully.

4. Dan Lunt is 26 years old and at present is a Captain in the Signal Corps. He is the type of brilliant eccentric with which every college staff must be leavened. He has his Ph.D. in physics, is an accomplished violinist, is alternately hated and adored by his associates. The inducement needed to sway him to college or university work after the war is probably merely a definite offer of any sort from a school that knows what it is doing and is alert. He probably won't seek out an academic job himself.

5. Louise Elliott is a pleasant, 28-year-old WAVE officer who had taught for three years before the war. She has an M.A. in a highly specialized field of scientific research, and is needed in teaching. Barring the ever-present accident of marriage, she will be available to the teaching profession after the war, although the

lure of specialized commercial research and business advancement will compete strongly both financially and economically.

6. Harvey Heaton is a pleasant Ph.D., now full Colonel, GSC. He has got where he is because in addition to having the necessary brains he also has suavity and ability to handle people. For a dozen years before his reserve commission landed him in the Army he had been an instructor and assistant professor in a large university, but he was not progressing satisfactorily, had been trapped by an academic cross-fire of personalities, and welcomed the uniform. He has rapidly made an excellent reputation for himself, and cannot afford either economically or intellectually to go back to the pit from which he was digged. He has in fact become too good for his old job, and will have to be offered a substantial and challenging opportunity if he is not to be lost to the profession.

7. Sgt. Carl Jolson is a chap who had two years as an instructor in a first-class university, where without a graduate degree he was completely lost in the ruck. He is brilliant, superbly talented artistically, and generally well-read and well-educated. He is, in the hackneyed phrase of the psychologists, "well adjusted," and will be a success as a teacher, as an artist, or as a business man. He has no intention of staying in the armed services after the war and no live desire to go back to school. But he is highly adaptable and intelligent and if he were convinced of the real desirability of it, and were underwritten to some extent, he could very easily dispose of the requisite graduate work when he gets out of the Army.

8. Chan Jemson is a 28-year-old economist who had his doctorate trembling almost in his grasp two years ago when he was in effect drafted into a government agency in Washington. He has there made a name for himself, and will have numerous lucrative offers made to him by the businessmen he has dealt with there. Yet he told me a few months ago that he did not want to go into business because while it fascinated him he knew that he would never go on to do the really creative thinking (and writing) he had intended if he plunged into banking or running a factory. But, he said, "I've been making \$7000 a year here; and with my present obligations I simply can't go back to finish my degree with the expectation of starting out as an instructor at \$3000." A clear case of a person potentially an excellent teacher, who can't afford the luxury of a profession for which he has every predilection and qualification.

These then are some of the people I am worried about. Rather, the prospective loss of such people to the teaching profession is what worries me. And this is nothing like a complete list, even in

its typical cases. A prominent member of the faculty of a large eastern university wrote recently to a young friend of mine. "Go ahead and finish your degree now, because we'll need teachers so badly after the boys come back we will be hiring anyone who can read and write. But of course the unqualified will be shaken out when the pressure is off." If this is true of a large, independent and wealthy university, it seems to me even more likely in the case of smaller colleges.

Most important of all, of course, are those whose cases can't be listed because we don't know who they are. They were undergraduates when the blow struck and their splendid zest for teaching had not even been discovered by the alert and eagerly sympathetic teacher or dean who knows that the creation of a new teacher is a species of necessary spiritual self-perpetuation. They are lads for the most part who have looked now upon the bitter face of death, or upon the disillusionment of regimented life which often is as bad as death. They will be men, adult and impatient of undergraduate academic routine, when they come back. They will be in many ways, if the truth is told, too grown up to waste time on the piddling sophistries, theories, dogmas, and outright fallacies with which our over-soft university training has been corroded.

II

What then can we do to attract new recruits and perhaps to call back a few of those typified by the above cases?

In the first place, we dare not afford the easy way of acceptance of the situation as one of the inescapable evils of war—"It always happens." If we do, we saddle our educational system with a burden of mediocrity that it can ill afford to carry, and we run the risk 20 to 25 years from now of having policies and teaching levels of our educational institutions dictated by this war crop that will constitute in the main our second-string people. Tenure and seniority carry great weight, and it is much easier to get mediocre teachers into an institution than it is to get rid of them.

Quite probably we will have to write off as lost to the teaching profession most of those who were lured into big business and government service by the glitter of gold and the prestige of politics

alone. They have become accustomed to a scale of living which the colleges can't support. On the whole, their absence is not a crippling loss. Fortunately, there are many mature teachers who left academic life for the duration from purely patriotic motives, are doing their war jobs to the best of their ability, and will be eager and contented to return to a life they appreciate and love in spite of its lack of glamour and gold. But those are not the young men we will so badly need.

On the positive side then, is there anything we can do to salvage from this brilliant and aggressive group of young people a sizable recruitment of scholars and potential teachers for our postwar world? I think these are a few of the things we must do first.

1. We can be honest with them about the teaching profession. Tell them it is hard work, and that professors are commonly depreciated by members of other professions, etc. Refuse to gild the lily. Let them know they will have to work long and hard, and then perhaps will have no job.

2. We must tell them frankly that the administrations of a majority of universities and colleges in the United States are far more interested in having a professor write a widely known book (on his own time) than they are in his doing a constant and brilliantly creative piece of teaching (on their time). They must know that pressure exists on the administration from other sources, and is likely to continue to exist.

3. We must make it clear that material progress goes more often to the glib talker and campus politician than it does to the sincere and capable but less opportunist teacher. And we might as well cease trying to gloss over the fact that campus politics are about as dirty and vicious at times as are those of municipal government.

4. The potential teacher must be made to realize that as an educator he will be blamed for all failures of the educational system. For instance, if alumni pressure pushes through an illiterate football player, the public will shout loud and long about "low academic standards" when the stumbling ox they have cheered on the gridiron gets up in public and "molders de king's English." The fault will be laid at the teacher's door, and he will have to take the baby in.

5. A potential teacher must realize that in all except the largest of universities the more intimate aspects of his life will be under microscopic examination by large and often puritanical segments of the community. Nobody gives a damn about the moral credo of a surgeon, a lawyer, a real estate dealer, a banker, a movie star, or a grocery clerk—in fact, slight divergences from the norm often appear to enhance them in the eyes of clients. But let a smell arise about a college prof, and his goose is really cooked—regardless of his exemplary conduct before his classes, or his brilliance in inspiring them to explore the paths of learning.

6. Finally, let's be fair about the actual pay of academic positions. Let's tell the aspirant that he will have to work as a drudge in the department for several years, and for doing more work than anyone else in the outfit he will get less pay. To be specific: after spending from three to four years in graduate study, and ten to twenty years in college or university teaching, he will be exceedingly lucky and far above the average if he can pull down an annual wage of \$4000 or more. (To many a mature, capable, and experienced professor of 45 or 50 years who is reading these words, even that figure represents wealth beyond his wildest dreams. And in these war times such a figure represents the annual "take" of an unskilled worker in a shipyard!)

III

Those in general are things that we have too often glossed over when we are trying to net a promising young fish for the teaching profession; and one of our first cares, if we are to get the worthwhile, sturdy specimens from this war crop, must be to come entirely clean on such points. We will not be ultimate gainers if we make a soft approach to these fellows—for the good ones are going to have many "soft" offers now that the shooting has stopped. The Navy is making a very frank and attractive bid for their continued peacetime services, and is at least outwardly abandoning the Annapolis tradition which otherwise might wreck its peacetime aspirations for quality if not quantity of officers. The Army undoubtedly will make similar attempts to hold tenaciously to the better young men with whom it has become acquainted. Business

not only has a lot of them now, but is prepared to do some pretty attractive bidding for more. Government certainly needs them and is ready to ask.

The appeals made by these four branches of the body politic are pretty obvious and they are the same basically. They are (1) superior immediate income, (2) a fairly pleasant and rewarding life (to a lesser degree in business and a greater degree in the armed services), (3) relative economic security, and (4) continued adventure and excitement. While the life being led by the officers in the armed services now is exciting, well-paid, and relatively secure economically, it is probably not in many instances the most pleasant life available. But you may be sure that all the old lure of pleasant life in pleasant places, "see the world with the Navy," "monkey jackets" in the tropics and skiing in the cold places will be played up after the war.

In approaching the situation it seems to me we have to decide two things: first, do we have to match these offers in order to get the people we want, and second, can the colleges match business, government, and the services in bidding for the available men?

I might as well give it as my opinion that we *must* match most of the offers or we are in for a terrific beating. Not only that, but I have a sincere belief that we can meet our competitors on the most important points, and hold our own. Let's take the points categorically.

1. Superior immediate income? No. We can't provide it and few of the candidates will expect it. Let's say so, and forget it—although certainly not abating our efforts to maintain a livable income level for our profession.

2. A fairly pleasant life? There of course we have, as ever, a decided edge on the competition. Academic people are not dull, although dullness is the hallmark of a fiction and movie professor. The very makeup of a college with its representatives of all sciences and arts, and surrounded as almost every faculty is by its prized halo of stimulating lunatics, precludes the kind of boredom found in a life where all of your associates are doing the same thing. Of course there are dullards—though there is not the maddening sameness of mediocrity that one finds on a peacetime army or navy post, or the incredible strain of competitive business. There is time

to think and talk and savour, and there are readily and constantly available a few kindred spirits in any faculty.

3. Economic security? When you actually come to think of it, although you don't know many affluent college profs, neither do you know many who have had to sell pencils on the corner. They don't retire so early in life as some people, but they are none the less happy for that. They usually manage to acquire a modestly comfortable home and a few thousands of books. They have often paid steadily through the years on some sort of annuity or endowment life policy, and in most of the larger and all of the more soundly administered institutions they have contributed steadily to a "Retirement Fund." At 65-70 years of age, with the children out of the nest and on their own, they can lean back in the porch rocker or even now and then take a modest vacation in Mexico, or one of the cheaper South American countries that will be opened to travel after the war. The Army and Navy will offer a much more generous pension compared with base salary than any sound retirement system could afford; but it is my firm conviction that an Army-pensioner goes less far in his circle of friends with what he has than does an old college prof. If by economic security you mean the assurance of a new fur coat and string of pearls for your wife each year, go somewhere else young man; but if you mean merely a fairly decent and solid living, I think the colleges can provide it.

4. Continued adventure and excitement? Frankly, this one worries me the most. Of course it is easy to whip up the old professorial enthusiasm for "the great adventure of books;" but somehow I can't see myself selling the thing on that basis to these boys who will come back from the wars of Europe, the Orient, and Washington. I know they will be keyed up, and many of them will be still unsatiated. But I honestly think our best tack will be not to hop around like bright-eyed dervishes whose feet are blistered from running over exciting passages of Huxley, Steinbeck, Pirandello, Dos Passos, Shakespeare, or Gray's Anatomy, but rather for us to admit flatly that our profession is not exciting nor adventurous in the ordinary sense of the words. A teacher's pulse does not often leap—then stop with that glorious sickening lurch that is the concomitant of excitement—despite what poets and old-school

writers would have us believe. "And as I saw the look of dawning knowledge in those dewy young eyes, I held my breath with the deliriously exciting realization that here, before my eyes, a scholar was being born!" No, teaching does not offer excitement or high adventure in spite of the high school teacher's rhapsodic chirping. But in the words of the young men of whom we are talking, "So what!"

The early "brain trusters" undoubtedly had at times an actual excitement engendered by their work. They were the lads who naively, for the first time in history, sowed in governmental practice the crop of fine theories of social and economic reform that had been commonplace as theories in classrooms for years. We are now in the position of needing another group of young men actually to evolve new theories in new classrooms. Only by such adventuring will progress come. In all probability after the war the governmental aspects of social reform will jell for a good many years to come, but actually the greatest quiet adventures in thinking and theorizing will again be those of the professor. This is a real and genuine argument to the vigorous young men who will wish to come back to college life from governmental jobs and from the services.

IV

We can very well afford to experiment with an incubator for the more fertile eggs in the basket. College teachers should be selected even while they are going through their government subsidized period of study as war veterans. Most colleges could well afford to go into the system of graduate assistants more heavily. For instance, a college or university could take the salary of an instructor, who may be required to teach four three-hour classes, and split it among graduate assistants who would carry one class each. The classic arguments against this sort of thing spring usually, I am convinced, from administrative laziness. On the average we would get better teaching out of enthusiastic greenhorns than out of over-worked and bored young Ph.D.'s who are forced through the enervating experience of teaching four sections of the same thing in deadly rotation.

We must, moreover, insist on a change in the attitude of people above instructor's grade toward these incubating teachers. If we are to get the desired results we must abolish the humiliating "academic rank" line that exists in two-thirds of the colleges and universities of the United States. These men are going to be mature in a way that few of us were mature at their age. We need not pamper them, but they must not be looked at as though they were ducklings in a hennery.

Finally, however, for recruits we will have to depend upon the missionary appeal which is at the root of all really sincere conversions to the teaching profession. Admitted that we are overworked and underpaid, that there are stinkers in our midst, that we are underestimated by other professions, that we are not constantly in a twitter of excitement about the dawning geniuses in our classes, and that at times we wonder how we ever got into this academic rat-race, we nevertheless should continue to convey to these young people the fact that teaching is a serious, dignified business. We have to let them know that a real teacher chooses that profession not as a stepping stone to another, but as the fulfillment of a deep inner conviction that he has something to give through teaching that will somehow save, or at least improve, the immortal thinking of students. And we have to let these young people see in us examples of people who have dedicated themselves with vigorous intent and honest objectivity to "develop and cultivate intellectually and morally" the minds of our students.

Only thus can we attract to our ranks the new blood we shall need so badly after the war, and only thus can we hold the ground we have gained in American education in the past 50 years.

A LIBERAL EDUCATION

By C. JUDSON HERRICK

The University of Chicago

What constitutes a liberal education and how to get it, whatever it is, seem to be the most controversial issues now before us. Professor Scott-Craig's incisive plea (this *Bulletin*, Spring, 1945) for five required college courses cuts down to the fundamentals of the problem with admirable clarity. As a naturalist I approach the problem from an angle different from that of the humanist and some points are suggested for further consideration. Our objectives are the same—the promotion of human welfare and enhancement of the values and satisfactions of life. It is of vital importance that from the beginning to the end of the educational program humanistic and scientific studies be closely articulated so as to ensure harmonious cooperation. The method proposed should work well at the college level except for two serious difficulties which were pointed out in the article cited. The first is the scarcity of teachers with the requisite training and perspective. The second and more fundamental trouble lies in the inadequate and inappropriate preparation of the pupils in the secondary and primary grades. To get the desired result we must begin at the beginning, not toward the end of the program.

The nub of the educational problem, we agree, is how to teach our students "the distinction between signals and the various sorts of things they stand for." This distinction is drawn by the child as soon as he begins to think and to talk, for words are signals which have no significance apart from the things to which they point. A large and essential part of education is training in semantics, in the use of symbols for ideas, and advance in both primary and higher education is dependent primarily upon improvement of skill in this employment of symbols as tools of thought. At the beginning the symbol is abstracted from a particular thing, "da" for daddy, my daddy. Generalization, that is, the abstrac-

tion of common features from diverse particulars such as "father" for all daddies, comes later, and the entire program of sound intellectual training consists in building up successive hierarchies of abstractions, each with its appropriate and precisely defined symbol, so that these symbols can be used as the instrumentation of the life of reason. The symbol may be a gesture, a flag, a picture, a word or other arbitrary sign, or a long and involved proposition. Whatever it is, the thing which it denotes must be rigorously defined.

Training in the use of language as the indispensable tool of thought must be continuous from the earliest prattle of the child, but speech is not the only instrument employed in thinking and perhaps not the most vitally significant. For fluent speech often conceals thought, or its absence, and, as Professor Coulter once said to Mr. Bryan, eloquent ignorance may be more subversive than heresy.

Thinking is hard work, work that we do with our bodies. It makes us tired and it is the body that is tired. The whole body participates, as is evident to anyone who has watched the contortions of face, fingers, and toes of a young child struggling with the composition of a difficult theme. Passive receptivity has no place in an educational system. The new fact or principle must be assimilated into the existing body of knowledge as a going concern, as vital process; otherwise it is as dead and inert as a stomach-full of indigestible fiber—and it may be with equally distressing consequences.

The progressive education movement has done good service (despite its obvious perversions) in impressing this truth upon us. And so, less than a century ago, Thomas Huxley introduced laboratory work into science courses with especial emphasis on drawings of things seen. To learn a thing one must do something about it and with it. This is as true in the realm of appreciation as of fact. A young instructor in a New York university used to go into a musical debauch during the grand opera season. His day-time leisure was spent at the piano thrumming out the themes of the next concert. He did not play very well, but his efforts to put his own interpretation upon a musical composition greatly enhanced his appreciation of the opera as rendered by the artists.

Higher education succeeds in giving rational discipline only in so far as ability to use generalization and abstraction is skillfully applied to the solution of problems as they arise. The accumulation of factual knowledge is indispensable, for sound generalization must be based on adequate particulars; but wisdom, not knowledge, is what we want to achieve in the upshot.

Intellectual discipline, of course, is only one component of sound education. Misdirected intelligence may be a liability, not an asset. Well-balanced appreciation of values is our only safeguard here, and this training too must begin at the beginning of the educational process. The child's acquisition of knowledge and his skill in using it always have a personal reference and this he never outgrows. The educator's task is to see to it that the personal interests are kept in proper balance with the social interests, for as we are constituted this is the key to successful adjustment.

Young children are surprisingly good at generalization about things actually experienced, and their experiences in the realm of values are more vivid and meaningful to them than are their contacts with the objects by means of which these values are achieved. They can and do abstract from them and generalize about them, unwittingly perhaps, and so characters are formed, for better or for worse. If training in the appreciation of values and the judicious appraisal of them has been neglected in childhood, it is too late to remedy the defect in college. The consequences of failure to meet these obligations at the primary school level are more serious in the domain of values than in the cultivation of intellect. It was not without reason that the parochial schoolmaster said, "Give me the child until he is seven years old and I care not who teaches him thereafter."

The artificial distinction so sharply drawn at the college level between the humanistic and the scientific disciplines is a mischievous perversion of sound educational method. These interests and attitudes interpenetrate from the beginning of life to its end and what nature has joined together let not academic bureaucrats put asunder. However diverse may be our methods of work, our professional rivalries and departmental jealousies, we must somehow manage to integrate these interests in a curriculum adapted to the needs and aspirations of our students. In pending reorganizations

of academic administrations during this crisis of postwar readjustment this is a crucial issue.

II

In his demand for this revolutionary change and for convergence of humanistic and scientific disciplines upon the significance and proper use of symbols Professor Scott-Craig remarks, quite incidentally, "In this task today the scientists have a much easier job than the humanists; for if a boy enters college claiming to be able to add up to 5 it is probable that he will be able to abstract and generalize to the extent not only of adding 5 sheep as well as 5 goats, but even of recognizing their fiveness." After many years' experience in teaching the natural sciences—including most of them at one time or another—I question the strategic advantages of the sciences in this matter.

The child learns very early to tell sheep from goats and to count them. At a still earlier age he learns the difference between pain and pleasure, to distinguish the good from the bad, and I opine that he is able to abstract the idea of goodness at least as early as the idea of fiveness. I challenge the current dogma that elementary education is necessarily pre-liberal (*i. e.*, factual and informative) and that it is the specific task of higher education to liberalize it in terms of abstraction and generalization. As already pointed out, the child begins to abstract and generalize, within the range of his experience, as soon as he begins to think and to talk; that is what thinking is. "The only way our students can learn," we are told, "is to be confronted first with the examples, the particulars, and then learn how to abstract the general truth, the universal principle involved." This is true from infancy as long as the educational process lasts, normally to the end of life. When I was studying arithmetic in a one-room country school the teacher, who was a carpenter in summer vacations, sawed a big block of wood into cubes and showed us how to build it up and how to take it down. The meaning of cube root was clear to us children at once. The generalization followed the particular, and this pedagogic method is as sound in the graduate school as in the kindergarten.

The caution to be observed here, of course, is that generalization

must not be attempted until the pupil has adequate experience of the particulars to be generalized. This is illustrated by an incident reported by an engineer (Dock Hogue, quoted by permission from the *Atlantic Monthly*, May, 1945) who was building roads in Liberia. A native boatman, Podie Number Two, was employed to transport boxes of supplies across the swamp in his canoe, and to guard against loss he was told to count the cases he moved during the day and after work to report the number.

"Boss," Podie replied, "I no be fit count cases."

Mr. Hogue says, "I was learning fast even if Podie wasn't," and then goes on with the story.

" 'All right,' I remarked, 'Every time you take a case across the water, you put a small, small rock in your canoe. When you knock off, you tell me how many rocks live for the canoe.' "

"Podie Number Two readily agreed. At dusk he showed up at the hut I was using for an office.

" 'Boss, it be nineteen rocks live for canoe.' "

"This hulking native could not count cases because they were something strange to him. Rocks he knew—so he could count them without difficulty."

Podie's education had advanced to the stage where he could count nineteen familiar things, but not nineteen strangers. It had not reached comprehension of nineteen-ness in the abstract. That educational deficiency was probably remediable, for the native did not lack intelligence.

So training in abstraction and generalization should start from known particulars and advance step by step toward the more general. The child must learn to count and to add before induction into the mysteries of the abstract symbolizations of algebra.

The ability to reverse the process and reason from the general to the particular comes later and requires more maturity of mind. This ability once acquired is a useful tool for economy of effort in the learning process and it is indispensable for originality or creative work at the higher levels. This training is preeminently the job of the secondary schools and their failure to meet their opportunities and obligations here is painfully evident to every teacher of college freshmen and to every business executive. It was claimed above that the inductive method of passing from known

particulars to general principles is the preferred method of teaching, from primary to graduate school. This is the line of least resistance, especially in introductory courses. But one cannot go far by this method without postulation of well-validated general principles to be used as data for further manipulation and generalization. In higher education the two methods go hand in hand and it is a sinful waste if the resources of the college must be frittered away in the futile effort to compensate for the lack of basic training which should and does begin in the kindergarten.

III

To me as student and teacher of science the two lessons to be drawn from this cursory survey of our pedagogical problems are, first, the urgent demand for integration in both theory and practice of humanistic and scientific attitudes, interests and methods at all levels of the educational process, and, second, the still more urgent need for radical reorientation of both humanists and scientists in their respective fields with broader appreciation of the scope of these fields and of the objectives sought in their cultivation.

What this implies in the humanities I am not qualified to discuss, but in the scientific field the issue is clear-cut. Science can contribute much toward better human adjustment if given a free hand, but until now the hands of science have been tied by bonds of mischievous tradition for which men of science themselves are primarily responsible. The traditional code of our cult declares that in "pure" science the search is for abstract truth, objective, impersonal, universal, and uncontaminated by human interest, emotion, or preference. This is good as far as it goes, that is, for laying the factual foundation for science. But science is not facts. We want to know the meaning of these facts, not to some detached omniscience, but to people. If a thing has meaning, it means something to somebody, and that meaning is what it is by virtue of what that individual is, his experience, his competence, and his character. Science is a human achievement, not a system of esoteric abstractions. It is what it is because the people who make it are what they are. This is as true of fact as of interpretation.

The "facts" of today may be the mythologies of tomorrow. Where today is phlogiston and the indivisible atom? Science is not a static body of knowledge; it is a living growing organization.

The dogma, "Science knows no values," is contradicted by the whole history of science and it is an egregious perversion of sound scientific method. Science is motivated by values sought and won; otherwise there would be no science at all. These values inhere in science as such; they are not decorative accessories or extruded by-products; and they are of two sorts. One of these is the personal satisfaction of the worker, what he gets out of it for himself; the other lies in the social consequences of his work. The scientist may draw his paycheck for the latter, but what really keeps him on the job is the former, for he would not work at it if he did not like it.

We want to know what is good for humanity, what it is that we should want to be and to have; and for several thousand years the strenuous efforts of our keenest thinkers to solve this problem in terms of wishful thinking, divine revelation or appeal to mystic absolutes of perfection have resulted only in contention and distress. This problem has not been solved by philosophical dialectic and it will not be, for the answer can come only by judicious study of actual human experience. We must understand human nature before we can hope to guide human conduct in satisfying ways. This is not at basis a philosophical problem; it is a scientific problem to be attacked by the scientific method. From the welter of desirables before us we must learn in the light of experience with them which are most worth while and how to go about it to get these with the resources available.

Science so far has contributed disappointingly little to the solution of the big problems of human, personal, social, and international adjustment. In the engineering details of tactics it is efficient, but in planning the strategy of the major campaigns it has failed us. Even social science has fallen down on the job. Why?

The reason is clear. Science cannot successfully attack a problem if the key factors are excluded in advance from its formulation. Human interests and values motivate conduct. These components of human experience can be investigated scientifically and set in their proper places in human economy. But science is help-

less here without radical revision of the traditional code. This is recognized by increasing numbers of scientific workers and the revolution is well under way. The humanizing of science is today an urgent educational problem. Otherwise the scientific method fails us where we need it most—in our personal and social adjustments to the world in which we have to live. The urgency for reorientation here applies, not only to scientists, but even more acutely to the public at large. For the scientific method must infiltrate every human enterprise. We must learn to regulate all of our affairs in the light of actual experience critically evaluated rather than blindly follow outworn tradition or the blandishments of self-seeking propagandists. Appeals to prejudice, greed, and unholy lust for power are very effective social instruments, as our present distress illustrates, and the survival of civilization depends on the acquisition by all of the people of a workable balance of humanistic and scientific ideals, motives, and methods.

The two classes of values which inhere in scientific work—the personal and the social interests—interpenetrate in all human activities. Humanists have been concerned primarily with the personal satisfactions. Applied science is specifically devoted to making the world a better place to live in, that is, broadly considered, to the social values, and these come down in final analysis to the personal comfort and satisfaction of the individual people. Our traditional code of scientific procedure leaves so-called pure science orphaned, cut off from all human interests “without attitude or indication of behavior.” We are supposed to work for some esoteric abstraction—truth—but practically this is not the way science is made. We work at something we are interested in because we think it is good for something. The distinction between pure science and applied science has faded out, for these two fields now overlap almost to their ultimate boundaries.

It is as important in industry as in science and art that the two sorts of value be recognized and cultivated in proper proportion. A physician with thirty years' experience in industrial medicine writes, “You can teach a man to operate a machine, you can give him good working conditions, you can give him security in his job—but it is the man's own emotional drives that determine whether the man will become a real success from his own standpoint” (C.

C. Burlingame, in *Mental Hygiene*, April, 1945). And that means from his employer's standpoint too.

This is our real job as teachers, in primary grades, graduate and professional schools, and all the way between—to cultivate a well-balanced appreciation of values, to teach what is most worth while in life and how to go about to achieve it. And this not in terms of abstract universals that can be reduced to rule but in terms of the specific native abilities and limitations of every pupil individually. This is what education is for and this is what a liberal education means.

FORCES THAT HAVE SHAPED DOCTORAL WORK¹

By ERNEST V. HOLLIS

United States Office of Education

Those who would try to improve Ph.D. programs, or even to understand them, need as part of their equipment a long range view of the social forces that have shaped current American practice. Let us make no mistake about it, those differences of opinion which characterize contemporary discussion and action have their roots deep in our educational and cultural history.

Atomic bombs bursting over Japan may assure the layman that all is well in our doctoral level graduate schools but this awesome event should not blind the educator to the turbulent cross-currents that bedevil effective graduate work. The release of atomic energy by the minds of men nurtured in universities heralds a greater revolution in the arts of war and peace than in the arts of producing better doctors of philosophy. We need desperately to devote more of our educational and scientific ingenuity and money to the development of a suitable seed-bed for the production of future intellectual leaders. Perspective for such an undertaking requires an understanding of the factors that have produced the seed-bed in which we now nurture advanced graduate students.

The development of the graduate school in the United States falls naturally into four historical periods: from the time of Thomas Jefferson to the founding of The Johns Hopkins University in 1876, a later pioneering period from 1876 to 1900, the era of standardization from the turn of the century to 1918, and a period of changing purpose that accompanied quantitative expansion between the two world wars.

¹ Drawn largely from Chapter I of the author's *Toward Improving Ph.D. Programs* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1945).

Graduate Education Before 1876

Perhaps the quickest way in which to describe the economic, religious, political, intellectual, and other social forces that shaped early graduate work in the United States is to look backwards at them from the standpoint of the founders of The Johns Hopkins University—our first full-fledged doctoral level graduate school. Why did this venture succeed instantly and serve to bring to a head the sporadic attempts at graduate education offered before that time at such universities as Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and other established institutions? This quick flowering of Johns Hopkins must be attributed to foresight in adjusting intelligently to social conditions and to skill in protecting the new school from the cross-currents of contemporary controversy, rather than to absence of such opposing doctrines as are now at work in American life.

At this period most American graduate students were flocking to European universities, especially to those in Germany. President Daniel Coit Gilman and his advisers wanted to develop Johns Hopkins to compete with these universities by reproducing most of their good characteristics and at the same time serving contemporary needs in the United States to a degree not possible for a foreign institution. He expected that in such a university all branches of knowledge would be taught and investigated, that professors would be free to formulate conclusions and offer instruction in accordance with their findings, and that students would be at liberty to take up whatever subject they chose as best suited to their interests and capacities.

Gilman realized that this was a hazardous undertaking and leaned heavily on the advice of professional colleagues both here and abroad, but especially on Charles W. Eliot, Andrew D. White, and James Burrell Angell. The graduate school that seemed fairly to leap into being was the product of their considered planning. These advisers knew how deeply the social forces at war in their own institutions were embedded in our history, and as practical administrators they understood the importance of protecting the new venture from violent collision with adverse educational, religious, and political pressure. To achieve these ends the new

graduate school was developed without sectarian or governmental control; there was no school of theology and no traditional college of liberal arts. The basis for these decisions should be presented more in detail.

Warnings from the Experience of Others

The significance of the planning done at Johns Hopkins becomes apparent in view of the experience of earlier American colleges and universities in dealing with social forces. For instance, the sectarian clientele of the College of William and Mary had quickly counteracted the attempt made in 1779 by James Madison and Thomas Jefferson to modify the prescribed Oxford curriculum then in vogue and orient it toward the scientific, philosophical, and other intellectual stirrings of the European enlightenment. Jefferson says of their experience on the board of visitors:

...we secured the abolition of two professorships of divinity and oriental languages, and the substitution of a professorship of Law and Police, one of Anatomy, Medicine, and Chemistry, and one of Modern Languages; and, the charter confining us to six professorships, we added the Law of Nature and of Nations and Fine Arts to the duties of the Morals professor, and Natural History to the professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy.¹

But college and church historians have documented the fact that neither the educators nor the churchmen of the day were ready for Jefferson's reforms, and the results he and Madison hoped for were not realized. In 1825 Jefferson tried again, with only moderate success, to secure the same ends through establishing the University of Virginia along practical lines and free of conservative church and college influence. Subsequent developments again proved, however, that traditions in higher education were more powerful than even Jefferson's ideals in shaping curricula and procedures at this institution.

Advocacy of a nonsectarian college or university suited to industrial and agricultural needs, while remaining a minority movement,

¹ Thomas Jefferson Randolph, ed., *Memoirs, Correspondence and Private Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Late President of the United States* (London: Colburn and Bentley, 1829), Vol. 1, p. 43.

became more widespread and intense after the renewal of our cultural relations with Europe in the decades between 1812 and the Civil War. This cultural upsurge brought into American colleges a rising tide of professors who had visited or studied in German, British, and French universities, and they became earnest advocates of the freedom in learning and teaching which they had experienced abroad. At Harvard University in the 1830's a group of professors under the leadership of George Ticknor and President Josiah Quincy were able to make some headway in introducing such ideals and in breaking the strangle hold of a single prescribed curriculum. But in the next administration these beginnings were swallowed up in a sea of faculty inertia and opposition. The same outcome must be recorded for a more thoroughgoing and indigenous effort made at Brown University in the 1840's by President Francis Wayland and his associates.

The sponsors of Johns Hopkins University probably were influenced even more in their decisions by the ill-fated efforts of President Henry Philip Tappan, during 1852-63, to transform the University of Michigan into an institution of the true German type. In his own words, Tappan sought

...to adapt the university to the present wants of the community. To this end a *scientific* course was organized, in distinction from a *classical* course; a school of engineering was instituted; a laboratory and observatory were erected; an agricultural school, and a school of military engineering were sought to be created. The University, as at present developed, is in part composed of the intermediate or predisciplinary course common to our colleges, and to the *gymnasia* of Germany; and in part of that which belongs to a university properly so called. And this must remain until all parts of a just system of public education are fully developed in their order and relations. When this is accomplished, the University can become purely a university—an institution for professional study, for culminating studies in science and literature and for many self-development.¹

A considerable minority of the Michigan faculty was ready to support this program of evolution into a university, but in the end

¹ "H. P. Tappan, Review of His Connection with the University of Michigan," *Regents Proceedings*, 1837-64, p. 1121.

Tappan was forced out of office amidst a flood of abuse and censure in which he was charged with trying to Europeanize the university through un-American doctrines, with "imitating English aristocracy, German mysticism, Prussian imperiousness, and Parisian nonsensities." In the public press, indeed, Tappan was denounced as being "altogether the most foreignized specimen of an abnormal Yankee we have ever seen."¹ While it may not be complimentary to their courage, it is small wonder that the sponsors of the Johns Hopkins venture wanted to avoid conflict with these rampant political forces of frontier democracy and narrow nationalism.

The determination to establish Johns Hopkins as a graduate school independent of the church, the state, and the liberal arts college tradition was undoubtedly increased by observing developments at Harvard, Cornell, and similar institutions in the decade following the Civil War. The prescribed classical curriculum at Harvard College had permitted the addition of scientific and technical subjects along with modern languages and literatures. But the instructional effectiveness of the faculty group led by Louis Agassiz and the crusading leadership of President Eliot were not enough to lift this break with tradition to the graduate level of work. A majority of the faculty declared that including scientific and professional courses lowered the standards of a genuinely liberal education and usurped funds heretofore dedicated to maintaining the ideals for which Harvard was founded. In response Eliot chided the arts faculty for being content to teach schoolboys only and pointedly remarked that they would never become even first-rate college teachers until they began to grow through research and teaching activities of their own at advanced levels. Despite these proddings Eliot, speaking at the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of Johns Hopkins, admitted that:

...the graduate school of Harvard University, started feebly in 1870-71, did not thrive until the example of Johns Hopkins forced our faculty to put their strength into the development of instruction for graduates. And what was true of Harvard was

¹ As quoted by R. Freeman Butts, *The College Charts its Course* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939), pp. 154-55.

true of every other university in the land which aspired to create an advanced school of arts and sciences.¹

The sponsors of Johns Hopkins were persuaded by the experience of Cornell University against expecting a new institution to be successful in developing concurrently a graduate and several undergraduate schools, even in an environment which, like that of Cornell, was protected from the excessive influence of state, church and the traditional arts college. Cornell was so positively oriented toward the nation's developing agricultural and industrial life that it opened, in 1868, with five parallel undergraduate curricula representing gradations from the "practical" or vocational through the technical-professional to the traditional pattern of liberal arts. So large a response was made to provisions for the immediate occupational needs of undergraduates that in 1878, a decade after the founding, the graduate school was still undeveloped; this despite the intelligent efforts of President White who had acquired his zeal for graduate work through serving on Tappan's staff at the University of Michigan. The readiness with which the country had responded to the ideas of Ezra Cornell and the provision of land-grant institutions convinced the leaders at Johns Hopkins that, at least in its early stages, a graduate school would have to be protected from the praiseworthy but engulfing vocational interests of undergraduates.

The decision to try out in the United States a graduate institution that would be as distinct from the college as continental universities were from the *lycée* and the *gymnasium*, and that would not be intellectually hampered by the dictates of sectarian and narrowly nationalistic groups, was not made on educational grounds alone. Gilman and his associates knew that the exercise of freedom in learning and teaching in Europe had led to the demand to "close the Godless universities and depose the atheistic professors." They also knew that this demand arose because the universities produced and disseminated research on higher criticism of the Bible, the Darwinian theory of evolution, mechanistic explanations of the universe, and pragmatic philosophy and ethics.

¹ *Celebration of Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Founding of Johns Hopkins University* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1902), p. 73.

Moreover, they knew that citizens both in Europe and the United States were convinced, or at least apprehensive, that these activities constituted threats to the existing order in religion, government, and society in general. The man in the street has always sensed lurking danger in any meddling with the folkways or any critical examination of what he thinks of as the eternal verities.

As part of their prudent planning, the Johns Hopkins group naturally wanted to avoid all unnecessary conflict with these widespread social pressures, though without compromising the virile program they had envisioned to meet contemporary American needs. Hence their decision to omit a school of theology in the new university. Even so, the temper of the times was reflected in the criticisms of religious people in Baltimore and the rest of the country to the effect that Johns Hopkins University inaugurated its program without an opening prayer but with a lecture by the Darwinian biologist, Thomas Huxley. "Huxley was bad enough; Huxley without a prayer was intolerable" is the way they put it.¹ However, a good deal of sectarian opposition to the science program, which was to be the heart of the institution, was averted by centering this work on the sciences basic to the study of medicine. Public opinion trusted science in its capacity of improving the healing arts.

The Early Doctorate of Philosophy

As it was first awarded in the United States, the degree of doctor of philosophy was without stable form and void of integrity. Each institution followed its own inclination about conferring the Ph.D. whether *honoris causa* or as an earned degree. In 1861 Yale University granted the first earned doctor's degree on the basis of two years' work beyond college graduation but with much of the advanced study done away from the campus. By 1873 that institution had awarded twenty-three such degrees, above 90 per cent of the American total up to that time. The University of Pennsylvania entered the lists in 1870 and in the early period conferred most of its earned Ph.D. degrees on medical students, while Columbia University began in 1875 by granting this degree in the

¹ Fabian, Franklin, *The Life of David Coit Gilman* (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1910), p. 221.

School of Mines after one year of graduate study. Harvard's first Ph.D. was awarded in 1873 on the completion of two years' graduate work in residence. Between 1872 and 1876 not more than five institutions conferred the earned degree and the number of degrees granted in any one year ranged from four to eighteen. In 1876, the year when Johns Hopkins opened, the University of Pennsylvania reported to the United States Commissioner of Education the award of seven earned doctor's degrees; Harvard reported five, Syracuse three, Michigan two, and Illinois Wesleyan one.

The leaders of the new movement in graduate education faced an immediately discouraging situation in the tendency of all types of institution to confer the Ph.D. degree *honoris causa*. Between 1861 and 1876 the doctorate was indeed awarded more frequently on an honorary than on an earned basis, and it was not unusual for the same university to confer it both ways. Apparently New York University was the first to do this, in 1862, and the practice was widely imitated. In 1876 twenty institutions conferred twenty-six honorary Ph.D. degrees. According to the best estimates 20 per cent of all Ph.D. degrees conferred before 1900 were honorary and most of them were awarded by struggling undergraduate colleges. Nevertheless; so important an institution as Princeton University granted sixty-seven honorary Ph.D. degrees as against twenty earned ones in the years from 1866 to 1896.

A Pioneering Period, 1876 to 1900

During the quarter-century following the founding of Johns Hopkins University, a dozen other institutions were sufficiently influenced by the standard it set to try, each in its own way, to give acceptable shape to its own somewhat formless graduate school. Especially did they try to stabilize the capricious and sprawling practices then being used in connection with the earned doctorate in philosophy. Off and on during this pioneering period, fifty institutions awarded the earned Ph.D. degree under conditions that varied from the most nebulous work through correspondence courses to one, two, or three years of genuine study in residence beyond the bachelor's degree. The slow progress made in this re-

gard is indicated by the fact that, of the forty-eight institutions reporting its award as an earned degree to the United States Office of Education in 1899, half were undergraduate colleges that conferred it on the basis of work of one sort or another done away from the campus. Actually 35 per cent of the 325 degrees reported in that year were so earned—for example, Taylor University in Indiana gave 14, Illinois Wesleyan University 11, and Gale College in Wisconsin 15.

While there were no formal agreements among the American universities that sought to establish Ph.D. work after the German pattern, certain common purposes underlay their efforts. They were frankly eager to meet needs for the satisfaction of which approximately 300 out of a total of some 500 advanced graduate students at the time considered it necessary to go abroad. Student enrollment aside, they shared the long-range desire to have the apex of our educational system in the United States rather than in Europe and Britain where it still was in 1890. To achieve these ends American educators did not, however, propose to adopt foreign graduate school practices uncritically; rather, they wanted to select those procedures which they considered suited to the needs of contemporary American life. They were far more concerned about importing German ideals of scholarship than about taking over European administrative machinery and conceptions of who should be admitted to graduate study.

Each of the dozen pioneering universities adapted German ideals of graduate work to the situation peculiar to itself. Institutional and faculty backgrounds varied as much as the insights and generalship of their leaders, and each faced a different combination of economic, political, sectarian, and other cultural pressures. The development of special fields of work in particular universities illustrates how different emphases of the Ph.D. degree came into being. The natural sciences developed in one way at Johns Hopkins and Pennsylvania because of strong medical schools; in another way at Cornell, Wisconsin, and most of the other state universities because local pressures came from agriculture and industry. Theological schools impelled Yale and Chicago to develop the classical languages while by design Cornell stressed modern languages and literatures.

Next in importance to impersonal social forces in conditioning any one of these ventures in graduate education was the vision and skill of a particular leader. For better or worse Hall and the Clark University of his day were synonymous terms; the same is true of Eliot and Harvard, White and Cornell, Angell and Michigan. During his administration and for a score of years afterwards the University of Chicago was the embodiment of William Rainey Harper. Gilman so permeated Johns Hopkins that through its seminal influence he is today the patron saint of the American graduate school. These instances, of course, do not intend to support the theory that progress comes through *führers* or other types of "great man" leadership. Rather, these men were so responsive to the needs of their day that they became symbols of the less widely known scholars who were members of their faculties.

Without exception the leaders of this period advocated a program of research and instruction calculated to minister to the everyday needs of national and community life. They were not afraid of vocational, professional, or otherwise utilitarian studies. In his inaugural address Gilman sounded a note that was reiterated generally by other presidents. He promised that Johns Hopkins graduate work would make for "less misery among the poor, less ignorance in the schools, less bigotry in the Temple, less suffering in the hospital, less fraud in business, less folly in politics." He believed that the attainment of such highly practical ends called for advanced study in many subjects for which graduate research had not before been customary, even in Germany.

That these emphases were not copied from Germany is made clear from the testimony of Friedrich Paulsen. Writing from personal experience and observation, this great German democrat and student of higher education, who received the doctorate in philosophy from the University of Berlin in 1870, has reported the narrow character of the graduate program at that institution at the time:

Convinced that I ought to cultivate at least some acquaintance with the natural sciences, I attended a course of lectures on physics by Helmholtz, who had recently accepted a call to Berlin. What

I was out for—fundamental concepts and comprehensive ideas—he did not dispense.

After explaining that he fared better in chemistry and physiology, Paulsen continues:

I should have liked to hear lectures on geography but the equipment of the university was extremely unsatisfactory. I tried to attend a course on German geography by Müller, but I found his lectures insufferably tedious, without any apparatus for purposes of demonstration—nothing but a bare enumeration of names. Nor were those of Kiepert, the learned historical geographer and designer of admirable maps, on a higher level. . . .

Generally speaking the equipment and program of the University left much to be desired. There were no lectures on history of modern art, nor even modern German literature—with the exception of a course of lectures on *Faust*. The other modern languages and literatures were no better off; it was not until the later 1870's that chairs began to be established for them. In those early days they were considered as lying outside the limits of strictly scientific work, Greek and Roman literature being alone regarded as amenable to scientific treatment and worthy of it.¹

This description of higher education in the largest and most progressive of the German universities of that day adds significance to the pioneering viewpoint in the American institutions. It is important to note that expansion into new fields took place as a parallel movement in the two countries. This was likewise true at Oxford and Cambridge where modernization of graduate programs of instruction did not begin until 1877, following reports from two reform commissions.

The vision of the great university leaders was of course not instantly or perhaps ever completely realized. Actual programs had to be developed in keeping with public sentiment and with what the available faculty could conceive and implement in terms of the capacities and backgrounds of students who enrolled. Too often a wide gulf separated these rudimentary, partial, immediately feasible projects from the bold and comprehensive reforms envisioned by the Eliots and the Gilmans. Many of the difficulties

¹ Friedrich Paulsen, *An Autobiography* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938) pp. 214-15.

inherited in the fact that most graduate schools were offshoots of earlier foundations, in which the college of liberal arts constituted the most important element. This distinctly American conception of a graduate school as an integral part of a total university repudiated the Johns Hopkins and Clark adaptations of the continental plan of university organization. This circumstance in no way lessens our indebtedness to the latter institutions as seedbeds for maturing graduate practice and for producing the initial supply of graduate professors.

Whatever its causes, there has followed in the wake of this accident of educational history a group of problems and issues related to the financing and administration of graduate schools, to their curricula, to faculty and student personnel matters, and to issues of academic freedom. In most universities the graduate school has only an office budget and the dean has little control over departmental budgets or the selection of staff members. Such matters are customarily determined by undergraduate considerations. The graduate dean and other general university officers usually have had much less authority than their undergraduate and professional school counterparts in shaping their respective courses of study. This departmental independence, if not autonomy, has made for a remarkable unevenness of quality in doctoral work in a given institution. The pulling and tugging of these issues on a university president is well illustrated by a sentence from a sketch of William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago:

He had to mediate and compromise between a divinity school and a [graduate] faculty to whose members he had promised entire academic freedom, and the spokesmen of an alarmed sectarian orthodoxy; between the requirements of an ideal for the University that constantly outran its budget, and the practical business sense of trustees and founders for whom living within an income was the first test of sound administration; between a public for whom a college was a school, and a band of scholars whose hearts were set upon research; between the promoters of immediate expansion into professional schools of every kind, with whom his own impatience sympathized, and the cautious advocates of consolidation within departments already established.¹

¹ *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons), Vol. 8, pp. 289-90.

The Era of Standardization, 1900 to 1918

By 1900 twenty of the fifty institutions conferring the earned degree of doctor of philosophy were passing from the pioneering stage to that of concern for advancing and protecting the practices they had evolved independently though often after informed consultation with each other. As a matter of fact much of the pressure for uniform requirements for the degree came from organizations of former students and from other outside groups. This trend was of course part of the larger movement to which the foundations and accrediting associations devoted themselves during this period, namely, standardizing and delimiting the scope, respectively, of the high school, the college, and the graduate school.

A list of the problems before the better institutions at the turn of the century is reminiscent of those we face in 1945. Each university required its own bachelor's degree or the equivalent for admission to graduate study; but there was at the time such disparity among undergraduate degrees as to make the "equivalent" mean whatever those responsible for graduate admissions in a particular school wished to approve. The residence requirement, another way of describing restrictions on student migration from university to university in the German tradition, varied by half-years from one to two full years. In some cases this requirement was accepted simply as the first period of graduate work. The whole time normally required for earning the Ph.D. degree ranged from two to three years; certain universities required this longer period only if some of the work was done away from the campus. The twenty institutions differed considerably with regard to requiring foreign languages: eight of them did not insist on any foreign language; another eight demanded French and German; three specified French, German, and Latin; and the remaining university required Latin only. Conceptions of an acceptable dissertation ranged within as well as among institutions, as they do today, from a brief essay to be typed and filed in the library to an original contribution that had to be printed. Fourteen of these universities required publication in some form. In certain among them there were no preliminary examinations for candidacy and the final examination consisted of an oral quiz on the disser-

tation; others required written and oral preliminary examinations and similar final examinations on the major and minor areas of study, in addition to defense against searching criticism of the findings and methods of the dissertation.

Toward the end of the pioneering period three outside groups, in the absence of any legal coordinating body, urged the universities to undertake a voluntary cooperative plan for standardizing degree requirements. But it was well within the twentieth century before their recommendations were incorporated into practice. In 1893 and again in 1896 the Federation of Graduate Clubs addressed resolutions to the governing boards of American universities urging the universal use of the maximum practice described in the preceding paragraph, except that there was no mention of foreign languages. Two other minor recommendations of the Federation are now widely followed, namely, that the dissertation bear the written acceptance of the major professor and be accompanied by a brief biography of the candidate.

The university senate of the Methodist Episcopal Church, speaking with authority to its affiliated institutions and as a recommendation to other universities, adopted a resolution in 1893 supporting the general use of the above maximum practice. It urged in addition that the bachelor's degree for graduate admission be based on at least three years of high school work and that time spent in professional schools should not be credited to the period required for the Ph.D. degree. In the same year the International Congress on Education, meeting at the Columbian Exposition, on the present site of the University of Chicago, recommended that a committee consisting of the presidents of Johns Hopkins, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Chicago, and California should determine and publish a list of universities, which might be extended or restricted from year to year, that it considered qualified to confer the Ph.D. as an earned degree. Seven years later this idea came to expression when fourteen of the country's leading universities organized themselves as the Association of American Universities.

The Influence of Educational Associations

Since the early 1900's four associations have worked more or less independently to advance or stabilize requirements for the Ph.D.

degree. These are the Association of American Universities just mentioned, the National Association of State Universities, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, and the American Association of University Professors. During the same period the philanthropic foundations, particularly the Carnegie and Rockefeller groups, and the regional accrediting associations have had a profound indirect influence on graduate education through their interest in increasing the number of doctors of philosophy on the staffs of undergraduate colleges.

The fourteen universities that came together in 1900 as the Association of American Universities were motivated by the wish to confer annually about developing among themselves uniform conditions under which students might become candidates for higher degrees, about raising "the standards of our own weaker institutions," and—to borrow a term from organized labor—about acting as the sole bargaining agent for American students who sought admission to, or advanced standing in, foreign universities.¹ The Association was quite generally recognized for the latter purpose by 1905; most institutions abroad followed the University of Berlin's statement on acceptable American colleges including its declaration that "in order to have work pursued at American universities credited to this faculty . . . the candidate must have taken his work at one of the institutions represented in the Association of American Universities."² The exercise of this function made it necessary for the Association to compile and maintain a list of colleges whose bachelor degrees were acceptable for admission to graduate work at home or abroad, an activity that in time led to semi-accreditation. The Association's statement of policy declared that European universities were to be discouraged from conferring the degree of doctor of philosophy on American students who were not prepared to take the degree from our own

¹ The fourteen member institutions were California, Catholic University of America, Chicago, Clark, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Stanford, Wisconsin, and Yale. By 1918 ten others had been added: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Northwestern, Ohio State, and Virginia. Since 1918 the total membership has risen to thirty-four through the addition of Brown, California Institute of Technology, Duke, McGill, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, North Carolina, Rochester, Texas, Toronto, and Washington University.

² *Graduate Handbook, 1893-94* (Ginn and Co., 1894), p. 13.

best universities, and from granting degrees to American students on lower terms than to their native students.¹

Prior to the compilation of its own list of approved colleges in 1913, the Association of American Universities certified to foreign universities its own membership and the colleges which were approved by the Carnegie Foundation for pension purposes or which met all of this foundation's standards except that of being free of sectarian control. At the urgent request of the Association, the United States Office (at the time called Bureau) of Education classified 344 colleges in terms of their fitness to prepare for graduate work; but there were so many protests that the list was withdrawn at the direction of the President of the United States.

During this period member institutions also admitted applicants for graduate work from outside the Carnegie list and for this purpose each university maintained its own private list of approved colleges. The experience of the University of Chicago is probably representative. In judging the equivalence of "other institutions of good standing" Chicago at first insisted on requirements for the bachelor's degree that were identical with its own. Beginning in 1903, however, it accepted without such a requirement the degrees of an unspecified list of Chicago approved colleges. By 1917 this list had grown to 289 institutions and in 1918 it was classified into three groupings; institutions whose degrees were accepted for admission without qualification, those accepted subject to any penalties indicated by an examination of the student's college record, and those requiring examination of both the college and the high school record. The Association's 290 approved colleges, some of whose graduate departments also give the Ph.D. degree, today constitute Chicago's priority list, but actually these institutions enjoy little advantage over colleges accredited by the regional associations.² Perhaps the list of colleges most universally used for admission purposes is the one prepared by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars. Today practically all ad-

¹ *Association of American Universities: Proceedings and Addresses of First and Second Annual Meetings, 1900-01*, p. 15. See also *Graduate Handbook No. 7, 1899* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. for the Federation of Graduate Clubs), p. 11.

² For documentation see Marcia Edwards, *Studies in American Graduate Education* (New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1944).

mission is by transcript of undergraduate work, supplemented by the opinion of the candidate's undergraduate teachers, and occasionally by the Carnegie Foundation's Graduate Record Examination. This change in admissions procedure and the fact that not many American students go to foreign universities for advanced degrees has limited what was once an important channel of Association influence.

The Association of American Universities has never looked with favor on the suggestion that it determine and publish a list of universities qualified to give the Ph.D. degree. It has been content to develop qualitative and quantitative standards which by consensus its members have followed and which it has hoped that nonmembers giving the degree would imitate. It has sought to maintain the Ph.D. degree on a high academic plane and this singleness of purpose has perhaps reduced its sensitivity to cultural developments that call for modification if the degree is to retain its social usefulness for a majority of the persons to whom it is awarded.

Within their orbits of influence the National Association of State Universities and the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, through their graduate divisions, have from time to time sought ends similar to those pursued by the slightly older organization. Their affiliated institutions have been by nature and situation less traditional and more responsive to contemporary needs, especially in the technical and vocational fields. Where precedents in the older fields did not apply, these institutions, working in uncharted areas, have had little by which to gauge their activities. The superior institutions in each association that had not been invited to membership in the Association of American Universities were nevertheless certain of their mandate to undertake doctoral work in areas of their major interest, and they had no doubt of their qualifications to do so. Because membership in these associations was not based primarily on capacity to offer graduate study, the stronger institutions are not in a position to pass on the qualifications in this respect of their weaker associates. This situation has not, however, kept the two organizations from working to maintain character and quality in graduate education. They have likewise operated to secure a high level of ability, training, and productivity in the staff; to apportion teaching loads so

as to allow time for directing graduate students and for conducting individual research; to provide adequate physical facilities and administrative arrangements sufficient to the needs of students and staff members; to protect the graduate character of advanced course offerings; and, most important of all, to secure candidates of genuine Ph.D. caliber.

The American Association of University Professors is the fourth of the associations that have influenced the shaping standards to govern the Ph.D. degree. This professional Association provides for the rank-and-file professor a medium for studying the problems of graduate schools comparable to that open to deans and presidents in the three associations already discussed. In 1915 this organization appointed a special committee to make recommendations on criteria for awarding the doctor's degree; three years later the committee made a comprehensive report which appeared in the Association's *Bulletin* for January-February, 1919. The significance of this document lies not in any novel proposal but in the completeness with which it presents professional opinion at the close of the first world war on standards for the Ph.D. degree.

The Influence of Philanthropic Foundations

All of the standardizing efforts made between 1900 and 1918 proceeded on the assumption that the purpose of the degree program was to train individuals who would either devote themselves to research exclusively, or who would combine research with the training of other research workers under university auspices. The assumption had been sound until around 1905 when a new and powerful combination of forces began to shunt recipients of the degree away from specialized university work into undergraduate college teaching and counseling in broad generalized fields of knowledge.

In order to be sure that they were pensioning college professors and making grants to bona fide colleges rather than to secondary schools, the philanthropic foundations—especially the General Education Board and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching—began to require, among other standards, that institutions employ six (later eight) professors, in as many depart-

ments, who held an earned doctor's degree.¹ This foundation stimulus, added to the pressure from regional accrediting associations for larger and larger proportions of doctors of philosophy on undergraduate faculties, created an immense new market for advanced students. These agencies had no immediate or direct interest in standards for the Ph.D. degree, but they so completely changed the occupational outlet of a majority of its recipients that it became incongruous to expect the degree to retain its social utility if administered in terms of the original purpose.

Graduate school officials responded in two diametrically opposed ways to the changed situation. First, they admitted a less homogeneous group of students and expanded their facilities to supply scholarly personnel for diverse occupations, including professors with doctor's degrees for the many colleges that were seeking to become accredited or to maintain such a status. But at the same time they proceeded with the standardization of degree requirements as if their purposes had remained unchanged from the days of Daniel C. Gilman. This disregard of the basic assumption that the social purpose of a degree constitutes the framework in which its content and standards should be developed led inevitably to the practice, frequently described in current professional periodicals, of observing the letter of requirements—in languages, thesis, and examination, for example—while winking at the spirit of these standards.

Expansion and Changing Purpose Since 1918

The first world war gave impetus to the forces that were changing higher education in the United States, and added components that in confluence with them inundated "the landmarks which the fathers set" at the beginning of the century. A review of the nature and direction of this impact should add to the perspective needed for solving some of the current problems connected with the Ph.D. degree. In performing such an exercise, however, the assumption must be avoided that the experience of the past necessarily holds the clue to all contingencies that may arise after the

¹ For details see Ernest V. Hollis, *Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education* (Columbia University Press, 1938), pp. 127-55.

close of the second world war. Social forces now barely discernible may well induce further change that could turn out to be just as significant and just as unpredictable as the redirection that resulted from the efforts of the philanthropic foundations and the accrediting associations after 1900.

During the interwar years at least three powerful constellations of mutually related societal pressures have combined to alter the nature and conditions of university work at the doctoral level. First, there were the factors associated with the phenomenal increase at this time in the size and diversity of the graduate student population. A second series of factors modified the methodology of productive research and transferred major responsibility for conducting it from the universities to governmental, endowed, and commercial agencies. And in the third place, there were factors basic to the struggle between public and private enterprise for control of the outcomes—and hence the means—of research. The effect of these complex forces on objectives, subject matter, and procedure in graduate education during the last twenty years has not been generally acknowledged by the profession, indeed it has not always been recognized. Perhaps we have felt it would be heresy to admit that vital changes have taken place in the inner nature of a program to the external orthodoxy of which we have steadfastly subscribed. At any rate, it is hoped that brief discussion of the three interacting groups of factors will contribute to a realistic understanding of the current situation in graduate schools and be a means to insights needed for taking the next steps forward.

The Altered Population of Graduate Students

What the deluge of enrollment following the war of 1914-1918 did to graduate practice was due in undetermined proportions to its volume, to its diversity, and to the attitude of orthodox leaders toward it. These factors will be examined in sequence.

As reported to the United States Commissioner of Education, the total graduate student body in the arts and sciences was 14,406 in 1918 and 54,584 in 1940. During the same period graduate-professional enrollment grew from a nominal figure to 51,535. In the quarter-century between 1918 and 1941 the number of Ph.D. level graduate schools grew from 46 to 96 and the number of

Ph.D.'s awarded annually rose from 562 to 3,526, an increase of 527 per cent. If this phenomenal influx of students had been as homogeneous and characterized by as much ability and singleness of purpose as was true of graduate students before 1918, and if they had been as warmly welcomed by graduate professors as were the earlier groups (both of which conditions were contrary to fact), even then staff and physical facilities would have been unequal to the strain placed upon them by the sheer weight of numbers.

The burden of volume was, however, accompanied by complicated problems inherent in the greater diversity of vocational purpose of these students. New social developments after the first world war made evident the need for scholarly personnel in areas such as human nutrition, home economics, agricultural specializations, social work, public administration, library science, speech, education, psychiatry, geography, meteorology, biochemistry, business administration, and physical education. Colleges, public schools, and public and private nonteaching agencies wanted trained workers in these and other growing fields. In addition they were on the lookout for masters and doctors prepared in the established graduate subjects of the arts and sciences.

The graduate schools faced a dilemma: the desire to expand and serve clashed with the desire to maintain hard-won standards and other evidences of respectability. From the orthodox viewpoint, genuine research could not be the touchstone for determining graduate programs in those of the new fields which had neither a scholarly literature nor a research tradition. Unless a field squared with these criteria responsible leaders were convinced it had no place in the family of graduate departments. And the question of what constituted acceptable fields of graduate work proved to be as inseparable from that of who was competent to give advanced instruction as body is from soul. In the absence of definitive criteria we continue to operate by compromise and gentlemen's agreements. New fields tend to be admitted to graduate standing as their representatives show strength within the academic hierarchy and establish the fact that their Ph.D. degree will serve some important social need voiced by the service area.

The enlarged range of ability and background among both

faculty and students, resulting from the increase in numbers, influenced the nature of graduate education in the period between the two world wars more than did the admittedly significant diversity in fields of interest. As long as our graduate schools enrolled less than 500 students it was plausible to assume that selective factors had somehow brought to this work only creative and otherwise superior minds and that a regimen centered on independent original research was suited to their and the nation's needs. But when the number enrolled approached 55,000 such assumptions became preposterous, and the leading graduate schools lost face with intellectual realists by holding to postulates that no longer applied.

University leaders who are concerned with preparing graduate students for the work society has for them to do, more than with upholding traditional ideas of graduate study, have consistently declared that much educational effort has been wasted through failure to recognize the mental limitations of faculty and students and through disregarding their special aptitudes and ambitions. These critics have insisted with some success that the graduate school Procrustes should adjust his bed of requirements to fit the needs of scholarly occupational groups and individuals rather than continue to force them into inflexible dimensions. Such persons have opposed the negative attitude, passive resistance, and stop-gap measures adopted by our dominant graduate schools in the face of the raging flood of social pressure that has been sketched.

Despite the fact that doctoral study now covers areas as diverse as physics and physical education or history and home economics, there is still a tendency to maintain that the graduate school is a unitary institution and that a single procedure may be used to transform advanced students of all types into competent research workers. When the situation is officially recognized for what it is, namely, that the graduate school has become an undifferentiated quasi-professional school, then most of the present artificial barriers to scholarly but practical programs of study may disappear—especially those related to course work, the tools of research, and the nature of the dissertation. Operation as a multiple-purpose institution does not in itself imply lowering of standards for research or other programs.

The Rise of Nonacademic Agencies for Research

The second group of factors mentioned earlier as having altered the conditions surrounding graduate study since 1918 is connected with the transfer of primary responsibility for productive research from the universities to other agencies. This shift, with its accompanying change of methodology from independent to cooperative work, has influenced policies governing the Ph.D. degree less directly but no less significantly than did the number of students and diversity of fields of study.

Before 1918 the universities were primary agencies for organized research in the United States. They were so important at the beginning of the first world war that President Woodrow Wilson authorized organization of the National Research Council to mobilize their strategic facilities for winning the war. At that time there were fewer than 300 private laboratories for industrial research in the country; these were small and devoted largely to routine testing and development rather than to basic research in their fields. There were no endowed research organizations to speak of aside from the Carnegie Institution of Washington and the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. The federal government was not then spending more than \$6,500,000 annually for research, most of which was going to the War and Navy Departments and to the land-grant colleges. Universities were clearly the leaders in fundamental research and this fact was an important determiner of graduate school policies.

When the second world war broke out the universities had become relatively less important in productive research, despite the fact that they have done an extraordinary amount of fundamental war research on a contract basis. This shift came about both because our economy had moved into a new era and because the same social forces that brought this about had driven the graduate school in the direction of becoming a multiple purpose professional school for scholarly workers in general. By 1941 the country had 2264 industrial research laboratories that employed over 44,900 full-time workers, three-fifths of whom were trained in research, as compared with 1000 collegiate institutions that by the most generous estimates employed 10,000 persons who gave only a fraction

of their time to research. As a matter of fact practically all university research was conducted in some 300 institutions by approximately 3000 professors who on the average devoted one-fourth of their time to it. The striking development of research bodies outside the universities is further illustrated by the pre-war annual budget of \$50,000,000 set aside for research by the chemical industries; according to data furnished by the National Resources Planning Board this figure by itself equaled the amount spent in 1939-40 by all the universities for all research purposes.

This development does not diminish the importance of conducting mature research in institutions of higher learning. All applied research depends on the quality and savor of the basic variety. The fact that prewar university research made no more than a minor contribution to the increasing mass of essential findings simply indicates that our economy has reached a stage of development that calls for greater differentiation of functions.

As the situation immediately ahead looks now, faculty members in graduate schools will probably be called on to devote more time and talent to preparing others for research and related scholarly activities than to doing productive research themselves. Controls in government and industry have become too complex and too dependent on research to make it possible to leave so vital a function to the off hours of university professors and to the work of their advanced students. On the other hand, much of the research required for protecting the public welfare and advancing private enterprise is of a routine nature that would tend to exploit rather than educate the graduate student. State universities and land-grant colleges charged by law with testing and standardizing activities of the type suggested have learned that they can make very little use of such programs for training research personnel. It is of course true that research workers can be developed only where research is in progress, but the study should be graduated to the candidate's needs and this is usually not feasible in a production situation.

This differentiation of function has provided graduate schools with richer opportunities for improving the education of personnel for the several scholarly needs of government, industry, and the collegiate institutions. Employers of Ph.D.'s concur in the opin-

ion that the years of graduate study should be devoted largely to the *education* as distinguished from the *training* of candidates. That is to say, they would like to see these years given to the study of fundamental principles in a given broad field, or in related smaller fields, rather than to acquiring specialized techniques that change from year to year and that can be learned most effectively on the job. They would prefer to see the research of the candidate's thesis demonstrate initiative, intellectual maturity, and grasp of the investigational procedures used rather than to have it exemplify what the academicians call an "independent and genuine contribution to knowledge." And, while the idea is frowned upon by many graduate faculty members, these employers would like more attention given to the selection and development of candidates as human personalities. It is their opinion that thinking has so much physiology and sociology in it that we cannot judge a person's mind without considering his whole being. They insist that ability to work cooperatively with fellow staff members and to develop normal sensitivity to social and community responsibilities is as essential to success as technical competence.

The Struggle for Control of Research

The third set of social forces now shaping graduate education is associated with the growing contest between government and private enterprise for the control of research. Each party has come to see in research a national asset of greater ultimate value than the natural resources it is currently developing. The issue is clear; power over the means of scientific research and technological progress offers the surest of all ways of regulating modern business—especially big business whose monopoly or competitive status depends on trade secrets, patents, and cartels. Since the university graduate school is the primary agency through which research workers are trained, it is in the nature of things of interest to both contending parties.

Analysis shows that approximately 90 per cent of the 44,900 persons mentioned earlier as being employed in 2264 commercial research laboratories were concentrated in one-fourth of the establishments. Half of them were at work in forty-five laboratories

and one-third of all industrial research workers were employed by the ten largest organizations. Concentration of this magnitude, coupled with cartels or other forms of trade agreement with related foreign industries, has led to a growing apprehension among those responsible for public policy over the possibility of misuses of research findings by industry. Large corporations are alleged to be withholding or suppressing data that might promote the public welfare at the expense of private vested interests. It seems evident that the effective promotion of postwar recovery and reconstruction is in part dependent on the proper control of this source of economic power.

Since the depression years and more especially since Pearl Harbor, government leaders in Congress and the Administration have conducted studies, public investigations, and prosecutions aimed at checking the situation. Among the results of such activities may be cited the three-volume study by the National Resources Planning Board entitled, *Research—A National Asset*; the nine volumes reporting investigations of the Senate Committee on Patents; the monographs and reports of the Temporary National Economic Committee; the report of the Alien Property Custodian, *Patents at Work, 1943*; and the three volumes of Senate hearings on "technological mobilization." The item last mentioned covers the hearings on a pending bill introduced by Senator Harley M. Kilgore "to establish an office of scientific and technical mobilization" to promote research in the national interest. A different bill to accomplish similar ends has also grown out of a proposal for postwar scientific research made to the President of the United States by the Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development—the agency that has coordinated wartime research for the Nation.

These activities, combined with the extensive war research contracts between the federal government and the universities, foreshadow a new rôle for institutions of higher learning. It is not impossible that after the war universities and endowed nonprofit institutes may be stimulated to expand research as rapidly as did industrial and business research after the first World War. Such a probability would be greatly enhanced, of course, if the principles of pending bills now before the Congress were enacted into law.

THE EXTRA-CURRICULUM AS AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION

By JULIAN L. WOODWARD

Cornell University

The American college is now entering on a period of post-war reconstruction. Faculty members will be returning to the campus after the broadening experience of functioning outside the cloister, a student body liberally interlarded with war veterans will be more demanding and less willing to take the traditional educational machinery for granted, and college trustees will feel some sense of responsibility for convincing the public that their institutions have learned some lessons from the war experience. In short there will be on many campuses a probably brief but significant period during which some educational experimentation will be possible. Perhaps it is true that only new colleges, or bankrupt ones, can engage in radical experiment, but there are a good many things to be tried that do not fall in the radical category. Among them are some to be done with and through that part of the campus machinery known as the extra-curriculum. It is these possible experiments with the extra-curricular institutions which form the subject of this paper.

II

The American college extra-curriculum is a hodge-podge of "student activities," athletic and otherwise, most of them highly organized. While there is considerable variation in detail from campus to campus the general pattern is the same nearly everywhere. A wide but more or less standard range of interests is covered; participation is at least nominally voluntary on nearly every campus; and the system has a set of honorific rewards largely independent of the success measures for classroom activity. The extra-curricular pattern exhibits also the following educationally significant characteristics:

1. The "activities" engaged in occupy a tremendous amount of time and use up a large share of available student energy.

2. Participation in activities is highly motivated, more so by far for the average undergraduate than his classroom work. This is probably in part due to the fact that the extra-curricular activities are carried on under less compulsion. It is even more a product of their prestige-giving character. While seniors annually vote the Phi Beta Kappa key as the most coveted award it may be doubted whether they really mean it, and especially whether they thought the same way when they were sophomores. Because of the motivated character of extra-curricular activities the efficiency of learning whatever the student does learn by participation in them is usually much greater than the learning efficiency in the classroom.

3. The extra-curricular system embodies the most of campus tradition and through it is organized many of the sanctions which mold the character of the developing student. Fraternities, sororities, and other living-house groups play a great part in shaping the personalities of members; as substitutes for the family they tend to exert much of that institution's potent influence. Other "activities" also are surprisingly influential through the force of their own traditions—they determine the level of campus political morality, perpetuate or perhaps combat race and class prejudice, and by and large fix the pattern of the successful man in the campus community.

If these characterizations of the extra-curriculum are accurate it follows that the curricular, classroom part of college life, the part for which the college is supposed to exist, is faced with serious competition. The curriculum and the extra-curriculum compete for the time and energy of the student, for his interest, and for the opportunity to influence the course of his mental development and shape his character. While faculty members often prefer to regard them as being in separate compartments, for only one of which is there any great professorial responsibility, actually there is overlapping and inter-influencing. That the extra-curriculum greatly affects the student's reactions to the classroom work (the time he spends, the concentration he employs, the interest he musters, the level of performance he seeks, the choice of specialization he makes) is probably a tenable thesis with respect to most American undergraduates. This means that the tail wags the dog with a vengeance.

What does the college faculty do about this second educational system that has grown so influential on the campus? While there has been some recognition of the importance which the extra-curriculum has acquired in the American college, and some effort here and there to do something about it, by far the prevailing attitude has been that of *laissez-faire*. The faculty has deplored the many student "distractions" which are thought to "interfere" with proper attention to studies, it has to some extent regulated student organizations and student functions to keep down excesses, but it has shown little real interest in the educational possibilities of the extra-curriculum or little knowledge of its present impact on the student. Doubtless the faculty's view of student activities is partly the result of what some would claim was an over narrow and too intellectualistic philosophy of education, which fails to recognize some of the important educational aims which the extra-curriculum, although in unplanned fashion, is already achieving. But even a professor who defines the rôle of the college solely in terms of mind training and the acquisition of knowledge, leaving out character and citizenship, is still unwise not to pay more attention to a set of campus institutions which profoundly condition, and frequently directly hamper, his pedagogical efforts. The fact that professors in the big schools are primarily research men rather than teachers is a possible explanation for the neglect to view the campus educational process *in toto*. Another is the conventional division of labor that has grown up among the staff of the college. Professors stay in the classroom and people called administrators, among whom are certain individuals of comparatively low academic prestige called deans of men, deans of women, coaches, student counselors, provosts, wardens, or house mothers, are charged with extra-curricular responsibilities and are supposed to see that "student discipline" is maintained, that the young animal is given wholesome play opportunities, and that his nose is wiped when he gets into trouble. Coaching, and particularly counseling, are being done better now than fifteen years ago, and with more faculty support, but there is still very little sign that the rôles have been fitted into any well-worked-out and over-all educational philosophy which would integrate classroom and extra-classroom activity. Until this is done the drawbacks in the extra-curriculum will not be eliminated and

its great potentialities as an adjunct to the classroom will not be realized.

III

It is probably too much to hope for a unitary approach to the integration of curriculum and extra-curriculum or for any sudden and complete revamping of either. Only in a completely new college planned from scratch could an ideal balance and inter-relationship between the two be achieved. In colleges now in being, with a campus tradition already in existence as well as a pattern of vested interests, change will come piecemeal if at all. What piecemeal changes, then, are within the limits of possibility? What could be done now to bring the extra-curricular activities into some sort of meaningful relationship with whatever educational aims the college professes, and into step with the classroom? Below are presented some general lines of approach to the problem which can be followed as opportunity offers on different American campuses:

1. If the present over-emphasis on the extra-curriculum is to be remedied the most obvious step is to enhance the appeal of the curriculum by improving the quality of classroom teaching. It is generally admitted that college pedagogy is not of high grade; many aver that it is poorer than that in the primary and secondary schools. When the classroom is dull it is no wonder that students put their youthful drive into "activities" which are semi-voluntary in character and which can be dropped when interest lags. The classroom cannot overcome all its handicaps in competition with "activities" for student interest but the gap can be narrowed considerably.

2. Wherever possible extra-curricular activities should be linked up with classroom courses, using the activity as a laboratory in relation to classroom instruction. This approach borrows for the classroom some of the appeal of the voluntary activity as well as the pedagogical advantages inherent in the so-called project method of teaching. Programs of the sort suggested already function on many campuses in the fields of dramatics, journalism, and public speaking. With the use of imagination and a willingness to

experiment they might be developed in politics, in accounting and business management, in sociology, in foreign language, and in other fields. The formation of student interest clubs meeting infrequently to hear papers or hold discussions is *not* what is being referred to in this paragraph, but rather an actual laboratory, integrated with the course outline and yet at the same time tied in with the campus prestige system. In the field of political science, for instance, a course in public administration might require participation in student government as a part of the program. While the top student government officials could still be elected in accord with democratic procedure a "student civil service register" confined to those electing the course might provide the committee chairmen and clerks, the auditors, the parliamentarians, the managers, and other experts required to make the activity system function efficiently. A plan with some of these features has already been tried at Syracuse University.

3. Student extra-curricular activities should receive guidance from competent faculty members. Colleges have athletic and dramatic coaches but often no corresponding pedagogue for student government, student journalism, student business management. At present students are often expected to learn the techniques and the standards of good practice from other students, with perhaps some casual and unofficial aid from a voluntary faculty adviser. This in effect means a bootstrap approach to lifting the level of performance; bad professional habits and low standards both of ethics and performance are likely to become a part of the tradition passed down from seniors to sophomores and there is no systematic way of eliminating them. Yet if the activities are allowed to compete with the classroom for the time of the student they must be presumed to have educational value and consequently be worth doing well.

The alternative to a let-alone policy is not rigid faculty control but rather responsible leadership and guidance by faculty members made directly responsible for the activities in question, in other words good pedagogy. Students are highly suggestible when they respect the competence of the person who advises them, and he should seldom have to order or forbid in connection with efforts to improve standards of performance.

4. Opportunity to participate in extra-curricular activities should be further democratized. The college should see that eligibility for editorial and managerial staffs of publications, for athletic managerships, and for executive jobs in other student organizations that the college charters should not be fixed on any exclusive basis by students themselves. Membership in organizations, and particularly the opportunity to hold the responsible positions that have especial training value, should be determined on a basis of individual interest and aptitude, just as would election of a course of study. A point system might well be used to distribute opportunity for office holding—at present on many campuses the rule is “To him who hath shall be given.” A few students are overloaded with campus offices and do justice to none of their jobs while others who need the experience of job holding do not get it.

5. There seems to be general agreement among unbiased students of the campus social system that something needs to be done about fraternities and sororities; they are too powerful influences on student character development and too potent also in defining for their members the whole meaning of the college experience to be allowed to operate completely free from educational control. But we first need to know just what their influence actually is, just what their traditions are and what are the directions in which they mold their members. If we find after research that most fraternities and sororities are, as the writer suspects, not only undemocratic but also rather actively anti-intellectual then we shall be on firmer ground in trying to combat these tendencies in them which run counter to the college's professed aims. Anti-intellectualism as embodied in the respectable “C” grade tradition, the pressure for extra-curricular activity prominence for the glory of the fraternity, the cult of low-brow conversation, the collection of lore on “snap courses” and “easy professors,” and the generally bad house conditions for study is after all only a set of attitudes. These attitudes are redeveloped in each student generation by force of tradition; they are not necessarily an inherent feature of fraternity house life.

One cannot, and should not even if one could, turn the fraternity house into a monastery, but something can be done to increase the prestige of the intellectual life within its portals and make its members more aware of the world outside the campus. Resident

counselors in the houses could help a great deal to change the atmosphere if they were properly selected and trained; a single adult gifted with some ability at leadership can change the whole character of an adolescent group, and without interference with democratic process among fraternity members either. There are other devices which would help also. Visiting lecturers and other distinguished guests of the college should be put up in fraternity houses whenever possible. Students from foreign lands should be admitted to membership. That powerful educational institution, the informal "bull session," might to some extent be harnessed under proper leadership, with some obligation on participants to check up the next morning on the glib assertions of fact made in the heat of argument. Finally, it is perhaps not wholly far-fetched to imagine the existence of inter-fraternity intellectual competition alongside the present inter-fraternity athletics program. After all the American public's great interest in quiz programs and prize contests is a similarly artificial creation, but one that has certainly raised the status of some kinds of learning in this country.

6. Students need to know more clearly why they are at college; they need to develop an educational philosophy with respect to their college experience. There are a number of ways to aid students to become aware of the reasons why certain courses are compulsory, others elective; why certain courses are not given at all; why examinations are necessary and what they are really trying to test; why some extra-curricular activities gain faculty approval and others are frowned on; and broadly, why college is better than the "school of hard knocks" in training our abler adolescents. Systematically arranged discussion of these matters between faculty and students would be a wholesome experience for both groups; if professors had to explain what they were driving at they might be led to reflect on their aims and methods and if students understood the "reasons why" back of the curriculum they would adapt themselves to it with considerably less pulling-back and evasion. Where curricular changes are in view student groups might well be consulted in advance, not with the idea that undergraduate opinion should be determining but again as an educational device, a means of interesting the student in and informing him about the process that is supposed to be shaping his development.

The present low educational morale of the American undergraduate should be improved by such experiences.

7. No matter how well planned the extra-curriculum and no matter how effectively it integrates with the classroom to provide a consistent set of pressures for student development there will still be conflicts among campus institutions for student time and attention and there will still be student maladjustment. A necessary part of the educational machinery must therefore be a much better student counseling service than at present exists on most campuses. The average faculty member, while he often gives effective help to particular students, has neither the time, the information, nor the talent to deal with the wide variety of student maladjustment problems, yet failure to cope with them successfully will produce a set of misfits whose presence will seriously compromise the effectiveness of the college's educational program for the well-adjusted. A staff of trained counselors will greatly reduce the number of academic casualties, but this will be only a part of its accomplishment. It will help to reduce personal handicaps that, while not sufficient to produce academic failure, will greatly affect the chance of success both in college and thereafter.

IV

It is recognized that many of the proposals just outlined run counter to a traditional point of view that has obtained among faculty groups. Many professors hold that the student when he arrives at college is mature enough so that he should be treated as an adult. What he does with time outside the classroom, what kind of society he seeks, what activities he engages in, should be the student's own concern provided he breaks no law nor brings the college into disrepute. While it is deplorable if he chooses to neglect his academic duties, that is all right too, provided only that he makes passing grades. In this view the college leads the student to water but it does not attempt to make him drink. Only by leaving him free to make his own choices can a sense of responsibility be developed; he becomes a grown-up by having to solve grown-up problems.

There is much in this theory to commend it besides its conven-

ience as a rationalization for faculty inaction. But it has been carried too far on many campuses. A freshman coming from high school does not somehow undergo a mysterious transformation when he leaves the parental roof and arrives at college. He is still an immature, suggestible adolescent who needs adult guidance on many matters besides his choice of courses. As a senior he is, or should be, much more mature and able to stand on his own feet but even then he cannot be trusted to construct and operate the campus social and activity system in which he lives any more than he can have completely free election in his courses. The institution must give leadership and guidance to both freshmen and seniors, in different degrees and of different kinds to be sure, but in sufficient amount to ensure that the graduate will be reasonably prepared to function effectively and constructively in a democratic society. Colleges have not been conspicuously successful in achieving this end in the past any more than they have been efficient in developing intellectual interests and aptitudes. Without coddling undergraduates or on the other hand unduly meddling with their private lives there is still much that can be done to direct and increase the impact of the college on the student and to come closer to realizing higher education's possibilities and aspirations. A re-evaluation and reorientation of the college extra-curriculum along some of the lines suggested in this paper might possibly help to achieve this purpose.

COLLECTIVE LIFE INSURANCE

By RAINARD B. ROBBINS

Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association

Editor's Note. Measures to provide economic security for teachers and investigators are means to certain ends: (1) to attract into the profession of teaching and research men and women of ability, and (2) to insure to teachers and investigators the freedom essential to scholarship. Attainment of these ends requires continuity of service for experienced teachers, adequate salaries, adequate insurance coverage and adequate financial provision for retirement. Without these, teachers do not have economic security. The article by Mr. Robbins which follows is concerned with one phase of this subject, namely, adequate insurance coverage for teachers during their years of active service. It was written at the invitation of the *Bulletin*. Mr. Robbins' acceptance of this invitation is deeply appreciated. It is hoped that his article will receive careful reading and that it will be made the subject of discussion in meetings of faculty groups and of Chapters of the Association.

Collective Life Insurance, as the name implies, is issued only to a collection of staff members of a particular educational institution, under a plan adopted by the governing board of the institution. It was developed by the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association to meet conditions at institutions with funded retirement plans and is of particular interest to members of faculties of colleges and universities.

Collective Insurance consists of term life insurance policies issued to individuals without medical examination. The amount of insurance for an individual decreases year after year as the individual grows older, in such a way that the cost of insurance remains the same each year. While no evidence of insurability is regularly required, all newcomers who meet the conditions of eligibility must participate in the plan and a plan will be started

only if from 75% to 85% of eligible persons apply; no fewer than 25 persons will be insured under a plan.

As thus outlined, this form of insurance is immediately on the defensive because we are accustomed to the amount of insurance remaining constant in policies issued to individuals, and in group insurance we expect either a fixed amount of insurance for all or an amount that increases with salary. To pay the same premium year after year and then have the amount of insurance gradually decrease seems, at first thought, to be obviously undesirable if not inequitable. However, growing acquaintance with family income and other decreasing insurance policies has accustomed us to the logic of this type of insurance.

It should be clear at once that no form of blanket insurance that treats alike all persons of the same age is intended to meet fully the insurance needs of all participants. This is out of the question because the needs of individuals vary with the make-up of their families and, even with the same apparent needs, there will always be room for their varied evaluation as compared with other uses of the funds necessary to meet them.

Purpose of Collective Insurance

Collective Insurance was really devised to make sure that all staff members of chosen classes or of all classes shall have some life insurance protection so that it will never be necessary to "pass the hat" in case of untimely death of any particular worker. A college cannot be expected to interest itself in the complete insurance program of each staff member, varying as this should with changes in the worker's family, but it is of real value to the college and to John Smith's colleagues, as well as to the members of his family, to know that John Smith has a certain minimum of potential survivors' benefits in case of his untimely death while employed by the college. This is the purpose of Collective Insurance. But how shall we reconcile with this purpose the decrease in amount of Collective Insurance as age increases?

In the first place, for a substantial majority of college staff members, the emergency need of life insurance decreases in amount as the member grows older. True, most men buy more insurance as they grow older and their family outlays increase. But perhaps

there will be no challenge to the statement that a widow with a baby or two is in a worse plight than is one with children nearing adulthood.

In the second place, if a retirement plan is in operation that makes use of retirement annuity contracts, the accumulation to the credit of John Smith's contract becomes a survivor's benefit if he drops off before annuity payments begin. These accumulations thus constitute death benefits usually increasing by about 10% of salary each year during early years and, through the effect of interest, considerably more rapidly during later years. Thus the annuity accumulation furnishes a very small death benefit at early ages and a very substantial one at later ages. Collective Insurance is substantial when the annuity accumulation is very small and becomes less important as the annuity accumulation grows. In fact, under most arrangements the annuity accumulation increases more rapidly than Collective Insurance decreases so that in all later years an individual has at least as much protection for his dependents as he had when the combined plans began.

"Units" of Insurance

Collective Insurance is available in so-called "units." A unit is the amount of insurance that can be purchased at the participant's age with premiums of \$1.00 a month. Since the premiums for each year of age pay for the insurance of that year, the amount of insurance involved in one unit decreases year after year while the premium for the policy remains \$1.00 a month or its equivalent. The schedule below will give an idea of amounts involved:

*Amount of Insurance Purchased with Premiums of \$1.00 a Month at Age Set Opposite
—Called One Unit of Collective Life Insurance*

<i>Age</i>	<i>Insurance</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Insurance</i>
20	\$2,430	50	\$760
25	2,240	55	510
30	2,180	60	340
35	1,970	65	220
40	1,580	69	160
45	1,150	70	0

Inspection of a complete schedule of amounts of insurance shows that the largest decrease from one age to the next is in the age in-

terval from 39 years to 43 years and amounts to \$90 of insurance. Since this is 10% of \$900, the one-year decrease in insurance under a one-unit Collective Insurance plan is never greater than the corresponding increase in death benefit under a retirement plan of the common 5%-matched type for salaries slightly more than \$900 a year.

Before leaving the discussion of amounts of insurance, it should be added that, while Collective Insurance policies, like all others issued by T.I.A.A., are nonparticipating in form, the Association's Board of Trustees has voted dividends year after year for these policies. These dividends take the form of increased amounts of insurance after a policy has been in force one year and, at present, this increase is 20% of the scheduled amount of insurance. Thus, if an individual insured in his thirties dies at age 40, the Association will pay \$1,580 plus 20% of this amount, making a total of \$1,896.

How the Plan Operates

T.I.A.A. will consider plans for Collective Insurance involving from one to three units of coverage. Premiums may be paid entirely by the college, entirely by the participants, or jointly by the college and participants in any predetermined proportions. Each participant receives an individual policy; there is no master contract. The plan is the fulfillment of a resolution of the governing board of the institution, which resolution determines who may or shall participate, the number of units for each participant or for participants of each class if it seems desirable to vary the number with different classes, and the division of premium payments between the college and the participants. Participation may be made voluntary or compulsory for eligible persons in service when the plan begins but the resolution must require participation of newcomers as soon as eligible. Of course, if the college chooses to pay the whole premium, there will be no question of voluntary or compulsory participation. If participation is voluntary, the Association requires participation of a stated percentage of eligible staff members, this percentage varying with the number of eligible employees as follows:

<i>If the Number of Eligible Staff Members Is</i>	<i>The Number of Applicants Must Be</i>
Less than 50.....	85% of number eligible
50-99.....	80% of number eligible
100 or more.....	75% of number eligible

Comparison with Group Life Insurance

Similarities between Collective Insurance and group insurance will be recognized at once. Both involve term insurance issued without medical examination and both must therefore be protected from special requests of uninsurable individuals. Both furnish large amounts of insurance for the corresponding premiums as compared with other forms of life insurance and neither accumulates equities that can be claimed by the persons whose lives are insured. There are, however, some essential differences and these should be related to objectives sought when a plan of either kind is being established.

Too often group insurance has been looked upon as bargain insurance; the colleges have yielded to requests for it because it has appealed to many professors as a cheap means of covering a substantial part of their complete insurance needs; hence the plans with amounts of insurance related to salaries. Individuals have probably given insufficient attention to the readjustments that are necessary if they transfer to other colleges and to their predicament if they are not then prepared to pay the large increase in cost to continue their insurance. Colleges have given insufficient attention to the possible increase in cost of such plans and to the fact that younger participants often pay more than the cost of their insurance while those advanced in age may pay only a small fraction of the cost of theirs.

A number of institutions are now embarrassed by the cost of group insurance plans arranged many years ago with no provision to discontinue coverage when a worker retired. Not only is the cost to the employer for these older participants very large, but, in many cases, there is no genuine defense for the insurance; life insurance, aside from a burial benefit, should be essentially to replace, in part, an economic value that disappears when the insured dies. When that economic value dwindles the justification for the insurance decreases correspondingly. But the cost to the

colleges of many group plans has increased very substantially merely through increased average age of men *still in service*. If the amount of insurance is approximately a year's salary and the individual pays the usual 60 cents per month per thousand of insurance, the cost to the college increases not only because the individual grows older, but especially because of the correlation between salary and age.

To illustrate, when *Instructor Jones* is age 28 and has a salary of \$2,000 he pays \$1.20 a month for \$2,000 insurance that costs not more than 90 cents a month. When *Professor Jones* reaches age 60 and receives a salary of \$5,000 a year, he pays \$3.00 a month for \$5,000 insurance that costs in the neighborhood of \$12 a month and the college pays the balance. In the meantime *Jones'* family has grown up; he has accumulated more of this world's goods than he had as an instructor at age 28 and he may have an accumulation of from \$10,000 to \$50,000 under his retirement annuity contract, this to be available as a survivors' benefit in case he should die before retirement. The college had better help *Instructor Jones* to protect dependents; college funds are probably being wasted in protecting *Professor Jones'* more mature family.

Under Collective Insurance the young man pays the same proportion of the cost of his insurance as does his older colleague; he can rest assured that he will not contribute toward the insurance of older workers. Furthermore, the cost to the college cannot increase with an increasing average age of participants. A college can enter such a plan with positive assurance that no budgetary problems will arise from it in future years.

Under a Collective Insurance plan each individual owns a contract with the insurance company, and if he withdraws from service he may continue this policy in force alone by paying premiums directly to T.I.A.A.; no change whatever is made in the policy; no conversion to a higher premium policy is necessary; the only inconvenience is that premiums paid by individuals must be less frequent than monthly, as provided in the policy itself.

An Administrative Measure

A Collective Insurance plan should be looked upon as an administrative measure devised to improve personnel relationships.

While there is embarrassment to colleagues if a fellow staff member leaves no provision for dependents upon his untimely death, perhaps the college as an operating entity faces the principal embarrassment. Hence the college as such has a selfish interest in seeing to it that no one shall die without leaving enough to enable dependents to make immediate readjustments without being objects of charity. This institutional interest, intensified as it is by the operation of the survivors' benefits of the Social Security Act with respect to employees of industry, justifies the college in inaugurating a plan under which it pays the whole of the premium, thus admitting its financial interest quite regardless of any question of responsibility. It also justifies a college in saying in effect to staff members: As a condition of employment here, you must share the cost of assuring the college of your insurance protection, at least to the extent of that of the Collective Insurance plan.

Interest of Individual Faculty Members

But if this is definitely an administrative problem, why should this article find a place in the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors? Perhaps this question need not be answered for the readers of this *Bulletin* but, as an outsider and interested observer, the writer would reply:

1. Each faculty member has a personal interest in knowing that each of his colleagues has the protection herein described.
2. The relationship of faculty members and administrative officers of our colleges is that of "associates" and is substantially closer than that between employees and employer in industrial organizations. Faculty members become a part of the institution and come to take a deep interest in the college as a going concern, sometimes quite apart from their individual relationships to the whole. The most valuable faculty member comes to look at the college objectively as if he were an outside observer of its operations, all the time having a deepening interest in the welfare of the college as such, quite apart from what this might mean to him personally. Of course, this point of view is not attained by some but the success of our colleges and their future welfare center about many selfless individuals who often so far forget their personal interests as to need the protection of the college for them-

selves if they grow old and for their dependents if they die in service.

The college is essentially an organized collection of faculty and students and it is by gradually growing to be a part of this organization that faculty members become distinctly different from mere employees. Their interest goes far toward giving direction to the college as an institution. Hence the expectation that the members of the American Association of University Professors will take far more than an individualistic interest in plans for Collective Insurance, just as they do in plans for income after retirement and all other plans for the institutions with which they are associated.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN FACULTY PROPOSAL ON SALARIES

By JAMES K. POLLOCK

University of Michigan

University salaries, like the weather, are often talked about but seldom does anybody do anything about them. It has now been twenty years since the well-known Yale survey was published, and in the interim only a few institutions have dipped into the vital field of the economic status of their faculties. Generally speaking, little substantial improvement in faculty salaries has been achieved in the last two decades. Median salaries have tended to rise in the period between the two wars, but little of fundamental importance has been done in the last twenty-five years to place college faculties on a satisfactory financial level where not only they but most other thoughtful citizens think they ought to be.

With the sharp rise in the cost of living, the effect of which was dealt with penetratingly in an article in this *Bulletin* in a recent issue,¹ the problem of the economic status of teachers has become very acute. At the University of Michigan as elsewhere, faculty members have talked about the situation for years, but fortunately a year ago they did more than talk. Starting with the local Chapter of the American Association of University Professors and acting through the University Senate, they ordered "a continued and comprehensive study of the economic status of the faculty." The President of the University was requested to appoint a representative committee to undertake the study. The only elected committee of the Senate, namely, the Senate Advisory Committee

¹ "The Salary Situation at Quaelibet University," by Ridendo Dicens Verum, *Bulletin*, American Association of University Professors, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 366-393 (Autumn, 1944).

on University Affairs, was designated by the President to undertake the task.¹

Organizing themselves to perform the assignment, the Senate Committee decided that the entire committee should accept responsibility for the findings and recommendations but that the survey should be carried forward by a Director of Studies. Segments of the problem were assigned to individual committee members or to other faculty members for study and report. In due course the reports were presented to the committee and formed the basis for the deliberations of that group. The total of 37 reports, some of them monographic in size, gives some indication of the thoroughness and care which characterized the survey. The committee also made a careful study of previous surveys made in a few institutions of higher education and of the records of this university. To secure information not otherwise available, the committee prepared and circulated to all the members of the faculty a detailed questionnaire. The committee also had the benefit of a number of valuable letters on the topic of the economic status of the faculty written by distinguished alumni prominent in their various businesses or professions.

The committee investigated every aspect of the problem over a period of a year and deliberated at length on each aspect. The salary situation, the cost of living, annuities and insurance, sick leave and death benefits, leaves of absence, housing, medical care, and supplementary earnings were the principal topics for study and report. Because of the thoroughness of the investigation and the general applicability of the findings, it seems desirable in the interests of the academic profession to present a brief summary of the recommendations of the Michigan committee.

II

Stated concisely, we believe that members of the faculty should receive such compensation as will enable them to do a good job. In addition to providing merely for his physical existence, the salary of the university teacher of today should, in the words of

¹ The members of the committee are as follows: A. D. Moore (Chairman), H. M. Dorr (Secretary), S. W. Allen, R. V. Churchill, J. W. Eaton, E. L. Eriksen, E. H. Gault, C. L. Jamison, A. H. Marckwardt, N. E. Nelson, W. C. Olson, J. K. Pollock, L. S. Simes, M. H. Soule, C. D. Thorpe.

one prominent alumnus, "enable him to secure and maintain the tools of his profession." This includes books and periodicals which keep him efficiently informed and up to the minute in everything relating to his work. It includes travel that swings a long enough radius to enable him to check the results of his work and maintain proper alignment with other forces and factors in the shifting scene of society. It includes attendance at professional meetings. It includes easy access to contacts with men and situations outside of the campus to give his teaching virility and the ring of authority. This also implies a physical setting that is appropriate to his function, that is, a comfortable residential setting which will command respect and promote efficient work. To quote from another distinguished alumnus who is a leader in industry, "His life should not be governed by petty shifts and mean economies, and he should be able to give his wife and children an environment consistent with his supposed value to society."

With this as the goal of salary policy, we are concerned with developing base salaries which will effectuate the policy. Salary comparisons are commonly made in terms of the median income of various groups. The committee feels that the 75th percentile of the salaries of comparable professional groups may well be used as a goal toward which university salary policy should be directed. This is based (1) on the assumption that the functioning of even an average, to say nothing of a distinguished, teaching staff requires men above the 50 percentile grade of mediocrity; and (2) upon the realization that whereas the university may hope to recruit some persons at the top in ability (percentile rank 100), it cannot hope to compete with the top nonuniversity financial rewards. We grant also (3) that members of the faculty should be willing to forego the highest financial rewards as an exchange for other advantages enjoyed in a university community. If the foregoing assumptions are accepted, a university pay scale should aim at a point between the minimum of the 50th percentile and the maximum at the 100th percentile, that is, at about the 75th percentile. The salary distributions available to the committee from professional fields reveal that the present median salary for the University staff falls substantially short of the goal of the 75th percentile.

Our deliberations have also convinced us of the need, not only of a well-defined *policy*, but also of a salary plan for the members of the university faculty. At present the system which prevails is individual bargaining with no fixed schedule and with wide diversities existing within ranks and departments and between schools and colleges. It should be obvious that academic rank inevitably loses much of its significance and prestige in the university when each department, school, and college gets what it can get for its staff members without much relation to what others are obtaining. In this budgetary scramble over the years some departments and schools have been able to secure and maintain a respectable range of salaries, whereas others have suffered undeniable losses.

In the last twenty-five years the size of the faculty has increased until today it numbers around 800 persons. This number is so large that as a matter of salary management it becomes essential to develop a salary plan into which faculty members can be fitted according to their rank, their service, and their accomplishments. A definite salary plan is also necessary in order to eliminate the many unfortunate situations which exist today, resulting not so much from discrimination as from lack of regular consideration for advancement. Without a salary plan no member of the faculty entering upon his work in the university has sufficient officially stated assurance that if he performs efficient work, he can in due course over a period of years have his salary increased and his rank improved. Strictly speaking, no department head today has any right to assure an entering instructor of anything more than the salary he is given upon entrance into the faculty. With a salary plan, one important feature of which must provide for regular step increases upon *certification of satisfactory service*, a member of the faculty can have the kind of assurance and incentive he must have if he is to perform efficient work. Although the committee found that a system of automatic step increases is widely used in government and business, it prefers a system which places the emphasis on regular review of the faculty member's performance by responsible authorities, and under which increases are given for meritorious service. Even a system of automatic increases would bring a vast improvement to the present hit-and-miss procedure, but a regular evaluation of faculty members before salary incre-

ments are ordered seems better to us. Briefly, the absence of a salary plan can permit a situation to exist which is favorable to uncertainty, anxiety, and administrative autocracy, thus defeating the ends which we believe appropriate to a distinguished university.

Administratively, a salary plan simplifies the whole budgetary and personnel process by requiring all salary questions to be dealt with according to an easily understood plan. Furthermore, with salary standards definitely set, policy-making authorities can always know how much money is needed to maintain the salary schedule. Salaries will then become one of the fixed and definite charges against available funds. Thus, the administration will not wait to see how much money remains in the budget after other expenditures have been provided for and is therefore available for salary increases. Instead, it will be able to consider necessary additions to personnel costs as definite an item as fuel or light, and not leave vital salary matters to chance and good fortune.

A salary plan is also necessary in order to overcome one of the bad features of the existing salary situation: namely, the wide differentials between schools and colleges, and between departments and between individuals within departments. We have not heard it contended by any member of the faculty that he is worth more to the university than some other member of equal reputation in another field and thus should be paid a salary which may even double that of another colleague in another school or department. It is of course contended with some foundation in fact that certain members of the faculty in certain schools and departments occupy a more competitive position, which inevitably must affect their less fortunate colleagues. But a proper recognition of the force of competition should not operate to deny to the mass of the faculty, not affected by competitive forces in outside employment, the right to receive an equitable remuneration. And unless certain minima and maxima are established, and unless rank is given significance in monetary as well as academic terms, the university places itself in danger of a factional division between "haves" and "have nots."

A salary plan, therefore, operates to prevent unfair discrimination, to reward faithful service, to provide greater security and in-

centive to the productive, to develop more general knowledge and understanding of salary policy, and to give a satisfactory budget status to salary matters. It is intended primarily to provide an orderly means for increasing and maintaining faculty salaries on a higher level than at present, and to improve morale and efficiency.

III

In the construction of the proposed pay scale several factors have been considered. First of all, a minimum entering salary for instructors must be set at a figure which will permit of existence in Ann Arbor at a cultural level. Second, a sufficient range of salaries for each rank must be provided in order to make possible a number of step increases over a definite period of time. These increases should occur at shorter intervals in the two lower ranks, where the minima are very close to the margin of actual living costs. Third, the salaries provided in all ranks from the minima to the maxima must be high enough to provide a standard of living compatible with the faculty member's professional status, and high enough to enable the university to compete with a reasonable possibility of success for the services of able faculty members. Fourth, in establishing a pay scale for the first time, attention must necessarily be given to the existing salary situation so that proposed salaries will not contrast too radically with those prevailing at present, so that the transition to the new scale can be made without undue inconvenience. Fifth, the range of salaries must permit of reasonable adaptation to different situations in the various schools and colleges. Inasmuch as the range of salary in the grade of full professor must be greater in order to meet the needs of competition in the various schools and colleges, a maximum salary for this rank is not herein provided. Sixth, the salary scale which was suggested was set with due consideration for the total university budget.

The committee feels that there is one other serious deficiency in our present salary situation: namely, the failure to recognize outstanding merit and achievement. So far as monetary reward is concerned, the best that can be done at the present time for an

outstanding member of the faculty is to make him a dean or put him in some other administrative post where higher salaries are paid. There never has been at Michigan any adequate way in which notable achievement in teaching or research could be recognized. At Yale, at Harvard, at Northwestern, at North Carolina, and other universities, specially designated professorships with high stipends up to \$15,000 exist for this purpose. The committee therefore is proposing a new rank, that of "university professor" with the hope that a number of the university's outstanding faculty members can be given this recognition now, and that other similar appointments can be made in the future.

In general, the committee urges the formulation of a salary policy, the development of a higher level of salary payment, and the adoption of a salary plan which will give effect to the policy laid down.

IV

With regard to salaries and related matters, the committee has made the following specific recommendations:

1. A substantial increase should be made in the next university budget, to be devoted to improving faculty salaries.
2. A salary plan which makes any necessary allowances for differences between schools and colleges should be adopted for and made applicable to the entire faculty. Such a plan should provide:
 - (a) Minimum and maximum salaries for each rank, excepting a maximum for a full professor, established after due consideration of what is necessary to provide a standard of living for the faculty compatible with the requirements of a professional position, and with a sufficient range in salary in each rank to permit regular increases for satisfactory service.
 - (b) Regular salary increments upon certification of satisfactory service.
 - (c) A new rank of "university professor" to permit of more orderly treatment of exceptional cases, and to provide an opportunity to reward outstanding service.
 - (d) Variations from the maxima and in the use of step increases should be permitted when competitive or other exceptional conditions, in individual cases or in certain instructional units, can be shown to require such variation.

Finally the committee recommended that salary adjustments necessitated by the adoption of the plan should be made upon the basis of merit determined by an evaluation of all members of the faculty. In this connection attention should be called to the careful study of the evaluation of faculty services previously made at the University of Michigan by a committee of the local Chapter of the American Association of University Professors and published by the University.¹

In order to safeguard the proposed salary plan against abnormal inflationary trends, the committee further suggested that after the salary plan has been put into effect, salaries of faculty members should be reviewed for upward revision whenever the B.L.S. index of the cost of living increases five points over the index on the date this report is adopted. All salaries which are less than \$3,000 and \$3,000 of all other salaries should be adjusted upward to an amount which will offset the increase in the cost of living as indicated by the B.L.S. index. Downward adjustments, however, should not reduce the base salary to which the index is applied. The above cost of living adjustment is predicated on the existence of a sound salary base. Numerous other recommendations of local application were also made.

The Michigan committee has thus formulated a very concrete set of recommendations applicable to its own peculiar situation but which, it is thought, are of general interest and applicability. Unless adequate salaries are paid to the members of the academic profession generally, it is going to be quite impossible to retain or recruit able persons for academic work. This is not a problem for any one university—it is a problem for all institutions of higher learning. But equally important is the establishment on a firmer and more satisfactory basis of the career aspects of the profession. Only by establishing regular salary plans and procedures in colleges and universities can educational institutions successfully compete today with government and business for the services of highly competent persons. Uncertainty, anxiety, administrative autocracy are all likely to exist where there is no published salary plan.

Unless faculty salaries are generally and not just individually

¹ *The Evaluation of Faculty Services*, University of Michigan, 1939.

higher according to a well-understood plan, we believe that the academic profession will slide farther down the economic ladder at the very time when its contribution to human betterment is so sorely needed. Several generations of hit-and-miss, fortuitous salary management in colleges and universities have not brought to academic staffs proper financial security or status. We think the time has come for a frank recognition that the economic status of the academic profession is bad, that it must be improved if higher education is not to fail in its appointed task, and that substantial and continuing improvement will not come unless boards of control and top management recognize and establish sound principles of salary management which for many years have been followed in government, in business, and in a few universities. The economic status of the academic profession is more important than buildings; it is more important than raising a few salaries. It deserves immediate attention throughout the whole country. But until the salary problem is reduced to principles and plans which give to personnel costs a top priority, we shall probably drift as we did after the last war into a deplorable situation.

In any event the Michigan faculty has delved deeply into the problem, has studied it exhaustively, and has come forth with recommendations which have been approved without dissent by the entire University Senate called into special session for the purpose.

A MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHER REPLIES¹

By MARIO A. PEI

Columbia University

Recently a nation-wide test conducted among college students revealed widespread shocking ignorance of the most elementary facts concerning American history. Many remedies were suggested, mainly involving the inclusion of compulsory American history courses in the colleges, despite the fact that such courses would be nothing but a duplication of similar courses already existing in elementary and high schools. Nowhere was it suggested that the *methods* whereby American history was taught, or the *teachers* of American history, were at fault.

But if a prosperous bank president, who took French for two years at the rate of three hours a week in high school twenty years ago and has made no attempt to keep up with it since, suddenly discovers that he does not remember what little French he once knew, the outcry goes up: "The language teachers and their methods are at fault! I shall never let my boy study French!"

If our "linguistic scientists" would only recognize the psychological aspects of language, they would realize that along with all other fields of human knowledge language skills are subject to desuetude. Not only American history and French are forgotten within a year or two of "taking" the course. Geography, mathematics, science, economics, gymnastics, even baseball and basketball and football leave the mind and the muscles. Listen to a quiz program where fifty silver dollars are offered in vain for the correct answer to what is the capital of China or of Pennsylvania, and you will quickly find out how prone people are to forget what they must at one time have learned. The writer once discovered that after a summer vacation he had forgotten most of his mathe-

¹ This article is in reply to "Progress and Reaction in Modern Language Teaching," by Robert A. Hall, Jr., which was published in the Summer, 1945 *Bulletin*.

matics, in which he had won first prize for four years straight in high school. Often one hears a man say: "I was born in Germany and spoke nothing but German as a child. Then I came to America, learned English, and forgot my German because I never had occasion to use it. Now I can't speak it any more." But it is only the bank president who tries to recall his high school French after twenty years of not looking at it, or a professor of linguistics advocating a new method, who thinks of blaming methods and teachers.

Who, outside of a professor of mathematics or an engineer, recalls offhand how to solve a quadratic equation or a trigonometric problem? (All of us, on the other hand, recall addition and subtraction, because we are constantly forced to use them in connection with our bank accounts.) How many of us remember the chemical formula for hydrochloric acid, the Bessemer process, the number of bones in the human foot, the Malthusian Theory, the circumstances of Kublai Khan's attempted invasion of Japan, or the diagrammatic analysis of a complex sentence? But we are supposed to remember our French, which we took only because there was a language requirement, were never interested in at the time because we never dreamed we would one day go to France, were exposed to at the rate of three hours a week for two years, and never looked at after leaving school.

Proficiency in a spoken language, as in everything else, calls for constant practice. ASTP trainees, at the end of their intensive courses, had become quite fluent; but it would be interesting to see whether those of them who were trained in Italian and later assigned to the Pacific still talk Italian as glibly after two years of no practice as they did at the end of their intensive courses.

II

On the other hand, some people very deliberately try to instill the impression that no one ever learned a foreign language in America through regular high school and college channels until the American Indianists, the Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies, and the ASTP came along and showed us how. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Americans who speak, read, and write fluently the languages of the American curriculum (French, Spanish, German, Italian) were numerous enough to stock our Office of Strategic Services, Censorship Bureau, Office of War Information, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Army and Naval Intelligence and other Government agencies at the outset of the war. It was mainly American language teachers, products of American high school and college language courses, who staffed the ASTP courses in those four languages, working for the first time in their lives under ideal conditions of hours, student-to-teacher ratio, and student interest. The results achieved by the ASTP were not a triumph for the "linguistic scientists," who were far too few in numbers to handle the entire situation, much as they would have liked to do so. They were a triumph for American language teachers, who proved what they could do under proper conditions, and who did *not*, in their great majority, subscribe to and follow the grotesque theories of the linguistic scientists, excepting only the conversational directive. The many episodes of the rôle played by languages in battle stress, as often as not, the fact that it was ordinary high school or college French, or German, or Italian, that was brought into play.

Not all the high schools and colleges in the country subscribed to the deprecated reading objective. In the more progressive schools, like the one where the writer taught for thirteen years, languages were taught in their entirety, and at the end of two or three years at the rate of four or five hours a week the majority of the students could speak and understand, as well as read and write, acceptable French, Spanish, German, or Italian. True, the Townsend Harris High School students were a selected lot. But where could one find greater selectivity than in the ASTP, where the soldier-students were carefully screened for I. Q., previously displayed linguistic ability (in high school and college!), and linguistic interest?

America has always had its specialists and experts in those foreign languages which were deemed essential for the American curriculum. What America has lacked in the past has been the geographical, commercial, and cultural incentive that the *average run* of European people has for learning one another's languages.

This incentive now exists, thanks to present-day communications and the close-knit international relations that we hope will prevail in the postwar world.

III

The methods and objectives of intensive and ASTP courses are described as involving: (a) a large number of contact hours; (b) small number of students per class; (c) combination of presentation of language structure and conversational practice; (d) emphasis on drill and the formation of linguistic habits; (e) phonemic analysis and transcription ("scientific" linguistic description); (f) use of native informants; (g) colloquial objective.

No language teacher in his right senses has any quarrel with (a) or (b). The only question in his mind is whether (a) and (b) can be wheedled out of school boards and college administrations which must be persuaded to be at least one-tenth as lavish with their limited funds as was the Army with the taxpayer's money.

There is nothing new about (c) and (d). Both were used, with extreme success, in the more progressive schools where some selectivity and classes of 20 to 30 rather than 40 to 60 were possible. It is primarily thanks to the application of (c) and (d) that the United States found itself provided with a modicum of language specialists even before the advent of linguistic science.

The use of the native informant is desirable where the teacher does not himself possess native-like command of the spoken tongue. This situation exists in the case of "unusual" tongues (Chinese, Siamese, Malay, etc.), and it is here that the native informant must play an important rôle. In the case of the old languages of the American curriculum (French, Spanish, German, Italian) and of some newcomers (Portuguese, Russian), enough qualified teachers exist who are either natives or have acquired native-like fluency. This is admitted by the "linguistic scientists" themselves.

The colloquial objective is debatable. It was needed for Army purposes. For ordinary high school and college students, it is probably desirable in the majority of instances. But there are also plenty of students who want to acquire languages as reading and research tools, not for the purpose of "ordering a beer in Singapore"

or telling the inhabitants of Adano to get their donkeys out of the way. Medical, engineering, literary, historical, law students often must acquire, for purely research purposes, some reading facility in tongues like German, French, and Italian. To put them through the paces of the oral technique and make them acquire a native-speaker accent is a pure waste of time. Our more progressive colleges and universities are coming to realize this fact and introducing duplicate language courses: one, in accordance with the oral technique, for those who want to speak a few phrases in the language; the other, by a rejuvenated "reading" method which is not necessarily literary, but has a bearing on the student's field of interest, for those who need only an understanding of a language in its written form.

This leaves only one really debatable issue: phonemic analysis and transcription, coupled with "scientific linguistic description." This is the real hub of the controversy. It is also the one feature that was *not* generally applied in the ASTP courses, save in that minority of instances where "linguistic scientists" were in charge.

The linguistic scientists, under the inspiration of specialists in the languages of the American Indians, have evolved "a body of novel and generally unfamiliar techniques" which "must be applied if an intensive course is to be fully successful." This is what the linguistic science school claims, and this is what the language teachers, supported by a majority of competent American and foreign linguists, deny.

In what do these techniques consist? First, in phonemic transcriptions, said to be "accurate," but which in reality are far from being either accurate or practical. They are not accurate because they do not correctly represent the sounds of the languages. For example: French *é* and *è* are represented by a single symbol; the justification offered for this is that the two sounds are in "complementary distribution;" that the *é*-sound occurs only at the end of a syllable, the *è*-sound only when the vowel is followed by a consonant in the same syllable. That this is not at all true is shown by such couplets as *les: lai; fée: fait; pré: près; épée: épais*.

They are not practical because they are offered as a mnemonic device in lieu of the regular written form of the language, which must later be learned anyway, unless our students are to be left

at the illiterate or child stage. When this time comes, there is endless confusion caused by the fact that the student must unlearn a word he has learned as e-PE and relearn it in its traditional spelling (and double pronunciation) *épais* and *épée*. By using their inaccurate, unscientific transcriptions, the linguistic scientists are simply staving off the evil day when the student must face his words in their actual written form or remain forever illiterate in the language he is studying.

The other highly objectionable feature of the "linguistic science" method is the so-called "analysis," which amounts to a new grammar of the language based on the spoken form alone, without regard for the written form, the history of the language, or the independent and replaceable words that go to make up a sentence.

This so-called "scientific grammar" consists of "what people actually say, not what someone thinks they ought to say;" immediately the question arises: "What people?" Upper-crust speakers, professional men, politicians, journalists, radio announcers; or peasants, illiterate laborers, speakers of local dialects, and jive-joint slangsters? For it is a fact that all civilized languages are socially stratified. It is likewise a fact that the higher we go in the social-educational scale, the more closely the colloquial language approaches the prescriptions of traditional, normative grammars which are not antiquated. Either our linguistic scientists want our students to learn lower-class slang or local dialects, in which case they ought to have the courage of their convictions and say so, or they want them to learn the "standard" cultured language, in which case there is no need for reorganizing grammar on the basis of "what people say."

But there is something far worse in their methodology than the use of stray slang forms, like the "I was laying on the bed" which is said to have found its way into a linguistic-science sponsored Army manual of English for French speakers, on the ground that "that's how 90% of the G. I.'s say it." There are brand-new rules of grammar, which are not merely weird, but misleading and impractical.

Take, for instance, the idea of using the feminine form of a French adjective as the basic form, and deriving the masculine from it by dropping the final spoken consonant. Actually, this

will work for about 50% of French adjectives (*grand, grande; petit, petite*; etc.). The other 50% remain unchanged so far as the spoken sounds are concerned (*rapide, rapide; rouge, rouge; final, finale; amer, amère*). Under the circumstances, of what practical teaching use is the marvelous discovery of the linguistic scientists? The student will still have to be told, in connection with each new adjective he encounters, whether he is faced with a case of the fall of the final spoken consonant or a case where the feminine and the masculine sound alike. Note how pedagogically practical, by way of contrast, is the old, traditional rule based on the written form: "If the adjective ends in *-e* leave it unchanged; otherwise, add mute *-e* and pronounce the preceding consonant."

If analysis means anything, it should mean "the breaking up" of something into its component parts, so that they can be individualized, separately identified and, if necessary, replaced. The linguistic science idea of linguistic analysis is to treat a sentence like *il ne vous y verra pas* as a single unit: *invuziverapa*, in which nobody knows what part is the subject, which is the verb, or what idea any of the other sounds of the group is meant to convey. All you know is that the whole hodge-podge means "he will not see you there."¹ Analysis, in its etymological significance, would require that we break up the sentence into its component parts and explain them, so that in case of need the proper substitutions could be made (*elle vous y verra; nous ne vous y verrons pas*; etc.). But since American Indian languages are largely polysynthetic (*i. e.*, consisting of elements which acquire their full meaning only when placed together), the linguistic science technique, carried over into a language like French, where the elements are fully independent, gives you a polysynthetic agglomeration like *invuziverapa* to chew on, and leaves you to draw your own conclusions. The linguistic scientist wants the brain to be used as little as possible in language learning. "Get it by ear, as a child gets it; never mind rationalizing about meanings," is his motto; "Here is a jumble of French sounds which, taken in its entirety, has a certain meaning. Take my word for it, and memorize it. Yours not to reason why; yours but to make reply." And this is called "linguistic analysis"!

¹ Note that the English *watchagonnado* of the comic strips serves precisely the same purpose for "what are you going to do?"

IV

Language teachers generally, and rightly, reject the linguistic science technique as incorrect, impractical, wasteful, and weird when applied to the languages of civilization. They do not, of course, deny that it may have its place as a purely scientific tool in connection with languages of a different structural type and a lower place in the scale of civilization.

As often as they defend their subject from the attempted inroads of linguistic scientists, they are charged with doing so not because they are honestly convinced, but because "they fear that their jobs, income from textbooks and prestige will be swept away." Only linguistic scientists can hold honest convictions, apparently.

That the motives of the linguistic scientists are not altogether free from earthly considerations, however, transpires from statements of this type: "Many more Americans need training in linguistic analysis, so that they can understand the real structure of the foreign language they are to teach, and explain it accurately to their students."

Can it be that the linguistic scientists would like to set up their own little methods-and-textbook hierarchy, to which they would like to see the much more numerous language teachers pay tribute?

Language teachers know something of methodological and textbook bureaucracies from past dire experience. They still recall how educational theorists knowing little or nothing about languages were nevertheless able to set up an entire series of "methods course" requirements, and how no person, no matter how well qualified by personality, teaching experience and knowledge of the subject, was able thereafter to obtain employment unless he or she had taken an entire series of methods courses and invested in a lot of methods textbooks. The former were offered and the latter written by people whose language ability was small, but who knew all about "motivation," "integration," "realia," "adolescent psychology," and similar things, of which the "linguistic analysis," "morphophonemic," "compound juncture," and "complementary distribution" of the linguistic scientists are strangely reminiscent. Recently, a glaring example of what methods requirements could

lead to was presented at a meeting the purpose of which was to urge the New York City Board of Education to introduce Russian into the high schools. It was pointed out that Russian courses could not be offered because no one was qualified to teach them, no matter how experienced in teaching or well versed in Russian. Board rules state that only those shall be qualified to teach a language who have had courses in the methods of teaching that language. But no courses in the methods of teaching Russian are offered anywhere, because Russian has not yet become a high school subject. This automatically disqualifies all the able, willing, and enthusiastic teachers of Russian and creates an ideal vicious circle: no methods courses, therefore no licenses, hence no teachers, hence no Russian in the high schools, hence no methods-of-teaching-Russian courses, etc.

The language teachers are resolved that this shall not happen again. They will not have linguistic scientists who are very, very imperfectly acquainted with French, but know all the patter of the American Indianists, prescribe to them how the subject in which they have spent long and weary years of specialization shall be taught. They are completely unimpressed by the "success stories" of publicity hungry linguistic scientists and a sensation-hungry press. To paraphrase the statement of linguistic scientists, they feel that "when given a fair and complete trial, with sufficient time, an adequate ratio of teachers to students who are selected and personally interested, and intelligent, forward-looking high school and college administrators," they can run circles around all the anthropological linguists on earth for what concerns the teaching of their own subject. This they have proved in the ASTP, and they are ready to prove it again.

IS CONSOLATION OF THE INTELLECTUAL POSSIBLE?

By MARY L. COOLIDGE

Wellesley College

According to Professor C. Wright Mills, who writes on "The Powerless People: The Social Rôle of the Intellectual," in an article in the Summer, 1945 number of this *Bulletin*, the contemporary American intellectual is in serious difficulties. The first paragraph of this article reads:

While the United Nations are winning the war, American intellectuals are suffering the tremors of men who face overwhelming defeat. They are worried and distraught, some only half aware of their condition, others so painfully aware of it that they must obscure it by busy work and self-deception.

In the following pages the intellectual's difficulties are described in considerable detail. In the final paragraph there is mention of an "external enemy" and an "internal condition." The external enemy is admitted to be one not "clearly defined;" he is apparently the set-up of things as they are. What aroused my interest on reading the article was the "internal condition," and this condition not viewed psychologically but viewed philosophically. That a philosophical view was relevant seemed clear from the fact that Professor Mills himself gives his discussion a philosophical setting. He does this in his second paragraph; and since various of the assertions made in it have a bearing on points to be noted later, I quote the paragraph as a whole:

Pragmatism was the nerve of progressive American thinking for the first several decades of this century. It took a rather severe beating from the fashionable left-wing of the thirties and since the latter years of that decade it has obviously been losing out in competition with more religious and tragic views of political and personal life. Many who not long ago read John Dewey with appar-

ent satisfaction have become vitally interested in such analysts of personal tragedy as Soren Kierkegaard. Attempts to reinstate pragmatism's emphasis upon the power of man's intelligence to control his destiny have not been taken to heart by American intellectuals. They are obviously spurred by new worries and are after new gods.

Nothing could be of greater interest to a student of philosophy than a new god. Are the sociologists really about to produce one? Not a little of what has seemed inexplicable in the past behavior and conversation of various sociologists of my acquaintance could, perhaps, be explained as preparatory activity directed toward this end. But while I shall look forward to the new revelation with the liveliest of interest, my own imaginative powers are quite unequal to the task of anticipating it. The direction which my own cogitations on the article in question took was, first, that of an analysis of the new worries, and, second, that of speculation as to whether—in the interval before the new gods are born—the older gods, long familiar to the philosopher, might not have some words of consolation to offer. The following observations are the outcome of this analysis and this speculation.

As I understand the matter, the intellectual's worries—*i. e.*, his internal worries—as reported by Professor Mills are threefold. (1) He is worried because his understanding has outrun his power. "Since he grows more frustrated as his knowledge increases, it seems that knowledge leads to powerlessness" (page 232). (2) He is oppressed by a sense of great, undischarged responsibilities. (3) He feels that society is failing to make use of the understanding that he could, and gladly would, place at its disposal, thus increasing the hazards of its already highly hazardous position.

So vivid is Professor Mills' account of these anxieties on the part of the intellectual that one hastens on to a search for possible consolatory suggestions. And the result of my own search was a conviction that one doesn't have to be philosophical in any special twentieth century fashion—that is, in the fashion of John Dewey or of Kierkegaard—but just generally philosophical, to find some rather substantial consolations for the first and second worries. The contemporary intellectual's first anxiety is that his understanding has outrun his power. But surely ever since there have been

intellectuals, their understanding *has* outrun their powers. Could one not, indeed, define the intellectual as one whose understanding *is* greater than his power? In the case of the intellectual whose chief interest is in studying natural phenomena this fact is abundantly clear and seldom causes anybody any particular concern. The astronomer understands not a little about the heavenly bodies; he can use some of this knowledge for practical purposes; but he is not in control of the astronomical universe. Moreover, the bigger the universe he understands becomes, the more his power shrinks in relation to it.

What really seems to be worrying Professor Mills' intellectual—and here we come to his second anxiety—is that he holds his moral responsibility to be commensurate with his understanding and not with his power. But this conception is, surely, philosophically an error. And an error guaranteed to produce panic. The astronomer who felt a moral responsibility for making a comet go into reverse would have every excuse for a bad attack of the jitters. It is true that other men—and it is with other men that the social scientist concerns himself—are not always and definitely outside the sphere of our possible intellectual or moral influences in the same way that the comet is; and it is thus less clear when we are dealing with human beings how far our power does reach, or could be made to reach. But surely the intellectual should be able to find consolation for, if not indeed a permanent cure for, a tragic sense of moral failure based on powerlessness, in the reflection that any interpretation of the concept of human moral responsibility that does not exhibit it as commensurate with limited human power, makes nonsense out of it. (Although at times the Kierkegaardian may appear to want to deny that this is the case, even he in the end, it seems to me, assumes that it *is* the case when, in good Augustinian fashion, he leaves man a creature in the hands of an omnipotent God.)

The contemporary intellectual's third anxiety, an anxiety based on society's failure to use his understanding as it should be used, raises more complex questions than the two previously discussed. One suspicion that reflection suggests is that possibly society may be showing good common sense in refusing to be led along new paths too fast. A consideration of Professor Mills' review of the

course which the intellectual's thought has taken during the first four decades of the twentieth century—the review quoted above—is not without its bearing upon this suspicion. That the account is a fair one I do not question. I take for granted that, had he not wished to make it as brief as it is, the author would have noted that not all pragmatists died off in the thirties, and not all left-wingers in the forties, that—in other words—the present-day camp of intellectuals still has among its numbers not a few pragmatists and not a few left-wingers even if they are fewer proportionately than they were earlier. Incidentally I might note that I am not sure just what the “fashionable left-wing of the thirties” was. Was it the political left-wing which included such writers as Laski, or the philosophical left-wing which included Carnap and others of his way of thinking? But for the purposes of this discussion it is unnecessary to have an answer to this question. Some left-wingers of both sorts are still working with much vigor to enlighten the understanding of their still unenlightened colleagues. That the “more religious and tragic views of political and personal life” of Kierkegaard and those influenced by him are an important element of the thought of the present decade, I entirely agree. I am not sure whether Professor Mills' implication is that because their appearance as a significant factor in American thought is more recent than the appearance of pragmatism or of left-wingism it thus shows more “understanding” of life. But, again, it does not much matter for the purposes of this discussion whether or not this conclusion is implied. I may also add that, were the account to be amplified, it should include at least a reference to the right-wingism which has had its headquarters in Chicago during the decades in question.

My purpose in considering these shifts in American intellectual opinion in the twentieth century has been to suggest that observation of them on the part of society may have something to do with its reluctance to follow the intellectual too far or too fast. To put the matter another way, is it altogether reasonable for the intellectual Professor A, when on Monday he discovers a new “principle,” to expect that on Tuesday the common man—or, for that matter, Professors B, C, or D—will drop other jobs and begin immediately to work out new practices based on this new principle? Haven't

the common man and Professors B, C, and D some ground for supposing that by Wednesday Professor A may have discovered a still newer principle?

One particular phase of the modern intellectual's anxiety about society's failure to use his accumulated wisdom finds expression in his scorn of current postwar planning. "Postwar 'planning' is the 'new propaganda' " (page 241). His conviction is that such planning unchecked by himself is apt to be naïve, self interested, mere wishful thinking, or downright dangerous. Now this conviction is undoubtedly well grounded. But some risks human beings as human beings are bound to run. To say that man is by nature a social animal and a rational animal is to say that he is by nature a planning animal. And the right to plan is surely an integral part of the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The present-day American can plan and is planning (in July, 1945) to win the war; but surely common sense demands that he plan for a future that *may* outlast the war. If to do this is dangerous, to leave it undone would be even more dangerous. And such planning *is* in fact, whatever one calls it, postwar planning.

The suggestion was made above that the intellectual is by definition one whose understanding is greater than his power. But the relevant distinctions are, in the last analysis, relative. Some men are more, some less, intellectual. If "*an*" intellectual is more intellectual than most people, he is *as an intellectual* one of a minority group. And since the intellectual we are talking about is an American one, he is clearly in no position to expect a perpetual dictatorship, however benevolent, by his minority. Faith in democracy is faith that, by and large and in the long run, human beings of all kinds working together come to accept plans rather better suited to meet their needs and desires than those they reject. Is our intellectual's "internal condition" so low that he has felt obliged to give up this faith?

Faith in the intellectual ideal, as related to practice, is faith that, again by and large and in the long run, plans based on understanding survive longer, and are made effective in a greater proportion of cases, than those based on un-understanding passion. It is in this latter faith that the very great majority of philosophers have through the centuries found the consolation needed when the

facts of history—contemporary history as well as past history—are faced realistically. Furthermore their older gods have encouraged them in this faith. And I do not exclude the gods of the twentieth century to date: certainly one would not exclude the man-made god of John Dewey; and even Kierkegaard's God, if I understand what is said of him, is not uninterested in history, and while he has a very low opinion of man's intellect has an even lower opinion of his passions.

Were I to be allowed to ask one question of the sociologists' new gods, it would be whether they will expect human beings to give up the intellectual faith just referred to. If so, it may indeed be true that consolation is impossible.

EDUCATION FOR FELLOWSHIP

By W. E. HOWLAND

Purdue University

Anyone who has had a hand in the reconstruction of a curriculum of study for a rapidly developing profession like engineering knows how difficult it is to find a place for all the subjects thought to be essential in training a specialist. As the field of knowledge of engineering has broadened both in magnitude and complexity three tendencies have become evident.

Many divisions have been formed and special curricula have been prepared for each; thus it has become possible for the individual to delve deeply into a particular branch of the subject. What he has lost in comprehensiveness he has gained in deeper insight and, because a spirit of cooperation between specialists has, in general, prevailed, great progress in the advance of the profession has occurred, especially in its technical phases.

But there is a limit to which specialization can profitably go. Many new branches have resulted from the combination of facts and skills from formerly independent fields of study. On every side one hears the complaint that specialization has already gone too far and what is needed is a new integration of all the conventional branches of engineering into a few functional divisions as, for example: research, development, and operation. If the fragmentation of engineering knowledge proceeds much further the specialists will not be able to understand one another. A certain minimum core of common knowledge and purpose is necessary for effective cooperation.

The second tendency has been the lengthening of the period of schooling. More and more practicing engineers have obtained a Bachelor's degree as a result of a four-year period of study after high school, and an increasing number are staying on in the University or returning for a Master's and even for a Doctor's degree, especially in certain fields. (The advance of technology has made

available the time needed for a prolongation of the period of study of the average citizen.) Obviously however, there is also a limit to which this tendency may go—a biological limit resulting from the need for establishing a family, the length of span of creative life, etc. There is a growing belief that schooling should serve mainly to *direct* the subsequent life-long self-education.

A third tendency is the evolutionary replacement of the less urgently needed older studies in a particular curriculum by newer ones which present the modern knowledge and methods required. The curriculum must constantly be overhauled to throw out the less useful, the merely ornamental, and the positively false. At the same time, of course, the foundations of knowledge of engineering which time confirms and consolidates (like mechanics and mathematics) must be carefully uncovered and presented to the student with evidences of their strength and value. These foundations, so-called, must themselves be subjected to the same methodical scrutiny as are all the other parts of the structure of engineering education. They are known as foundations mainly because they have stood and proved themselves indispensable. They have not, as others have, disappeared into the quicksand of oblivion, carrying with them false theories to which they had given temporary support, and if they have at times unwisely been dug up they have had to be replaced when the superstructure of dependent knowledge proved too weak to stand without them.

II

Now I venture to say that education in general, and in particular what is often called general education, is subject to these same three tendencies. A certain amount of specialization and differentiation is inevitable; for example, engineers do not need precisely the same general education as lawyers. But there is a limit to which this process should go. All men must have enough common knowledge so that they may be able to work together as citizens of a particular community as well as workers in a given industry. The period of formal general education may be extended, but here also there are necessary limits. Consequently there is a great need in general education to reject the more dubious

and dependent knowledge and to hold fast to that which proves to be not only true, but also basic and necessary as a preparation for life among men, and for continued growth of humane understanding.

Please note that this notion assumes that there is a core of truth—of sound doctrine, if you like—about life which should be taught to our children; it is also a warning of the difficulties in the way of determining what that doctrine should be. It is a counsel of eternal vigilance to subject all doctrine to the X-ray of reason and experience so that flaws may be detected and the faulty and irrelevant thrown out to make room for what is urgently needed. Only thus may education win the next race with catastrophe!

In presenting my views as to what should be the essence of a general education I am going to emphasize some of the same elements as those discussed (and X-rayed) by Alexander Meiklejohn in his book *Education Between Two Worlds*, which I have read with much appreciation and profit. Therein are traced the changes in educational objectives which have taken place from the time of Comenius (1592-1673), through that of John Locke (1632-1704), to the days of Rousseau (1712-1778).

The main theme of this book is a plea for a new direction—a new purpose for education—namely, to attain fellowship; the mutual advancement of individuals and the cooperative creation of a good society. It is a protest against education for the purpose of selfish advancement of individuals, for their success in competition with their fellows.

The way to the attainment of this new purpose for education is to correct what the author regards as the prevailing faulty philosophy of the State. This imperfect and harmful theory, expressed by John Locke, is that although God made individuals and endowed them with their rights the State was made by men and receives or loses its rights at their will. Hence, the State, and society too, have only a precarious and unsubstantial claim to their service and loyalty. The older theory, represented by the ideas of Comenius, was that God made both man and the State, and the mutual obligations and rights of both were established by God on an equally sound and firm foundation.

The new and wholesome modern theory which will restore the

one-time balance of moral obligations, and of validity of the rights of individuals and of the State, is that both are on an equally dignified but essentially human foundation. When the State as a representative of society is thus accorded its proper coordinate authority it may do more than act as a policeman. It may indeed discharge its duties as schoolteacher with which it has been charged and it will then engage in the aforementioned education for fellowship and become an agent of the reason in creating a good society of fully developed individuals, which is its proper function.

Comenius believed that God created both man and nature: individual men and society and all individuals and classes of men in society. And it was the business of education to teach men about the whole of the grand, harmonious unity of God's creation. It *was* a unity since it was conceived in a single mind; it should be understood, therefore, as such. The several subjects of the curriculum should be tied together and coordinated in the closest manner possible. New subjects are not to be added to the several grades of the curriculum, but the old ones are to be continuously restudied on a higher and higher plane as knowledge grows in the mind and the mind increases in power. What is more pious than to gain knowledge of God's universe? We are thinking God's thoughts after him.

A list of a portion of the Table of Contents from Comenius' book, entitled *The Great Didactic*, will give some notion of his educational philosophy.

1. Man is the highest, the most absolute, and the most excellent of things created.
2. The ultimate end of man is beyond this life.
3. This life is but a preparation for eternity.
4. There are three stages in the preparation for eternity; to know oneself (and with oneself all things); to rule oneself; and to direct oneself to God. . . .
5. The seeds of these three (learning, virtue, religion) are naturally implanted in us. . . .
6. If a man is to be produced, it is necessary that he be formed by education.
7. A man can be most easily formed in early youth. . . .
8. The young must be educated in common and for this schools are needed.

9. All children of both sexes should be sent to school.
10. The instruction given in schools should be universal.

III

Locke, on the other hand, though equally orthodox (*i. e.*, in accord with the accepted tenets of his own religious organization which, I believe, was the Church of England), has reservations in regard to the extent and unity of God's creations. "Comenius was a Christian *so . . .* while Locke was a Christian *but . . .*" is the way our author puts it.

Locke's scheme would train a few gentlemen; Comenius would provide education for all. With Comenius training for piety and virtue go hand in hand since they both follow training in intelligence. The three elements must be "Bound together by an adamant chain," to use Comenius' words. With Locke a separate training for each element is to be provided and care should be taken lest the young gentlemen give too much time to intellectual pursuits as exemplified by a study of philosophy, mathematics, and history. "But of good breeding, knowledge of the world, virtue, industry, and love of reputation, he cannot have too much."

Locke's educational scheme was aristocratic. It was intended to help the favored few to hold on to their privileges quite as much as to perform their duties; hence it was prudential and conservative, animated by fear of loss of power and of ideas of equalitarianism or of what we would call "social justice" which tend to undermine the sense of right in holding privilege. Contamination of servants and tutors is dangerous but even worse is that of fellow students; hence he would not send the young gentlemen to school. He uses the phrase "abhorred rascality" in referring to the common people. He would provide purely vocational schools for their children, ages 3 to 14, cost to be paid out of the labor of the older children which he estimates to be sufficient for the entire cost of the venture, notwithstanding the nonproductiveness of the younger ones.

"When he plans for the education of a boy of his own class his interest is directed solely toward the welfare and prosperity of that boy but when he proposes arrangements for the training of the children of the poor his interest is not in them, but in the crafts and

industries of England of which they are to be made docile, dependable, industrious, obedient instruments," our author writes.

And Locke's idea of the State fits quite perfectly into his educational philosophy; in fact, it may have partly determined that philosophy. He writes, and I quote from Chapter 9 of the essay entitled "Of the Ends of Political Society and Government":

The free man in the state of nature "is willing to join in society with others who are already united or have a mind to unite for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties, and estates, which I call by the more general name, property." (Please note the similarity and yet the significant difference between the above and the phrase "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness," which is the American version of 1776.)

"The great and chief end, therefore, of men's uniting into commonwealths and putting themselves under government is the preservation of their property."

"But, though men when they enter into society give up the equality, liberty, executive power, they have in the state of nature into the hands of society . . . , yet it being only with an intention in everyone better to preserve himself, his liberty and property . . . (for no rational creature can be supposed to change his condition with an intention to be worse)."

The center of gravity of Locke's thinking appears to be "property." But the kernel of Rousseau's ideas is contained in the word "fellowship." They differ from those of Comenius mainly in their theological setting. Men are to be trained to be brothers one of another. It is proper that they should be so trained by the State, which is in no wise an opponent of the individual as Locke assumed, but rather an expression of all that is common among individuals and as government, an authoritative agency to accomplish their common purposes, including the universal desire to do what one likes in so far as he does not interfere with the similar desires of other people. Governments that fail to do this must be altered or overthrown.

IV

Meiklejohn sees all of this in the writings of Rousseau. I presume it is equally correct to credit these ideas to the times from

which Rousseau himself obtained them, the times which saw a "new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Those who fail to see or even to imagine the State in this light, for whom the phrase "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" has no sensible meaning, such persons imagine the individual and his government to be forever at war one with another. The American experiment in democracy has taught them only fear and suspicion of government. Following Locke they employ an out-worn theological phraseology to bolster up the "sacred" claims of a few individuals and of certain institutions against the almost universal desires of individual men when expressed through their government or by the State. As the people have turned more and more to the State as the chief agency to protect their rights and to grapple with grave problems of regional and of world-wide scope, these self-styled Americans of pre-American ideology cry out in alarm. Like collectors of American antiques they prize the colonial (however rickety) above anything that has been fashioned here since we thought of becoming a nation.

I hold with Meiklejohn that the reconstruction of a general educational policy must proceed from a clear recognition on the part of all concerned of the proper rôle of the State as educator; the State, as an expression of the common will, as a defender of individual rights to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," as an appropriate instrument to "promote the general welfare" to use the words of the Constitution.

If the State is to be trusted with the great responsibility of education, it must see to it that it does not destroy in the minds of youth the basis of its authority as teacher. Its instruction must be clear on this point—clear and effective. For this purpose the curriculum must surely include a summary of the development of thought on these vital matters, of political and social theory as affected and illumined by actual events, not only in Europe but also in our country and in our city, in other times and also in our time.

Abstract theological or philosophical theorizing wholly from ancient writings will not do as substitutes, nor will mere Civics as usually taught, nor the training in citizenship that comes from playing on a team, nor lectures in patriotism given by well-meaning but

uncritical patriotic associations like the D.A.R. Some of the courses now given and many of the student activities should, I believe, be dispensed with in the public school system to make room for the needed instruction. And qualified teachers must be secured. Nothing less than sound, scholarly teaching will suffice to do the job.

The general education of *all* members of the democracy as Comenius believed not only of the professional elite, but of all youth and citizens, laborers and bank presidents alike, should be directed toward the great aim of fellowship, of living together successfully in America and in the World, and this aim should be explicitly stated not merely in antiquated words and phrases but in meaningful modern terms.

V

There are those like Meiklejohn who can project their minds into the setting of other times and places and find in unfamiliar and exotic words the significant thoughts which are appropriate to our times. For example, despite the "other-worldliness" of certain of Comenius' notions, Meiklejohn finds in them a warm concern for boys and girls who work and play on earth. In the idea of the fatherhood of God he finds expressed the brotherhood of man, which is the basis of his philosophy of democracy.

But others like Locke find in the same words quite opposite meanings. In this connection, consider the political-economic views of Mr. Malcolm Pirnie, the former President of the American Society of Civil Engineers. Mr. Pirnie has planned water and sewage systems for many great American cities, and well knows what a large part the State, through its various departments and agencies, plays in furnishing the people with highway transportation, facilities for the promotion of the public health, for recreation, irrigation, water transportation, flood control, power, etc. Yet this outstanding engineer quotes with approval in his recently published presidential address the following words of Walter Lippmann: "In a free society the State does not administer affairs of men. It administers justice among men who conduct their own affairs." In other words the State does not

administer the affairs of men except as a policeman! Is it not also fireman, postman, conductor, and school teacher—road builder, bridge builder, forester, and guardian of health? And when the State so acts are not the people acting? Is a city-owned water supply administered less by the people than is the corporation-owned water supply?

Bethink yourself, Mr. President—a very large number of your engineering colleagues are servants of the State and as such administer the affairs of men and these affairs are important. You should represent their views as well as those of the “interests” that would reduce the State in fact to the rôle of corner policeman. It is difficult for a State institution of higher education to train civil engineers for the public service, to impart to the students the proper attitude and respect for their own work, when responsible representatives of their professional Association express the view, albeit indirectly, that what they are training themselves to do is un-American. It is almost as if the American Medical Association should take the opposite stand and declare that the healing art can only be administered by loyal Americans through public clinics, notwithstanding the fact that the vast majority of physicians are now private practitioners.

Lest I may have overemphasized the importance of certain mistaken political theories upon general educational policy, I will in conclusion attempt a balanced statement and summary of my views.

I conceive it to be the function of the entire public school system to impart to all a knowledge of men: of their bodies, minds, and hearts, of their weaknesses and prejudices, of the vast potentialities of their mutual endeavors, as revealed by the history of progress to date, to the end that they may gain an appreciative understanding of themselves and of their fellows, that they may willingly direct their work into socially useful channels and joyfully contribute to the success of living together; likewise, and parallel with this instruction, to impart to all students, but to each according to his ability, the technical knowledge and skill needed to perform a useful function in the work of society. And the sign and seal of success of all this instruction is that the students find joy in it and thus are led progressively to substitute the pleasures of intellectual pur-

suits, of lifelong self education, for the meaningless trivialities of sports and of a so-called social life.

College life is now, as was the life of a "gentleman" in Locke's time, too often an escape from life as well as an escape from college. The time is long since spent, if indeed it ever was, when a man can afford to spend the time to learn the arts of wasting it. I believe it to be the duty of the school to urge upon its students and alumni the moral obligation to remain efficient and steadfast in performance of the tasks which it has trained them to do for society despite the allurements of pleasure in social distractions or of easy money, of unearned income, from the sometimes questionable enterprises of the commercial world.

And the university which the State provides must be, like Cardinal Newman's, a "seat of wisdom" of the humanities, "a light of the world" of science through research, "a minister of the faith" of our faith in democracy, as well as the "alma mater of the rising generation." The president of such an institution once said, "This is a State University *but* there are those who love it." But indeed! We love our alma mater not less but more because she belongs to a still larger family that includes us all: a fellowship which is the State.

THE WARTIME AREA AND LANGUAGE COURSES

By CHARLES S. HYNEMAN

Louisiana State University

World War I introduced mental testing to the American people and elevated the study of psychology to a place of great respect in the college curriculum. World War II has called forth a number of experiments which will influence the college curriculum but none seems more certain to have a significant postwar effect than the foreign area and language course. The significance of this particular innovation probably lies mainly in what it has taught us about the ability of Americans, young and old, to learn foreign languages, but it has also given us startling demonstrations of how to improve our methods of teaching language and other subjects.

We prefer to fight our wars on somebody else's ground. This makes it necessary to learn about the places where the fighting will be done and most useful to be able to talk with the people we'll meet when we get there. The Army and the Navy know this and, early in the war, each branch of the service established schools to give officers and enlisted men this knowledge and facility. Three of these "area and language" programs have genuine significance for peacetime college education. They are the Foreign Area and Language Study Curriculum of the Army Specialized Training Program, the Army's Civil Affairs Training Program, and the Navy's School of Military Government and Administration. Of these three, the Foreign Area and Language Curriculum of the ASTP is undoubtedly of greatest postwar significance.

Most of the ASTP courses put a heavy emphasis on engineering, mathematics, and the sciences, but the Foreign Area and Language Curriculum was an outstanding exception to this rule. It came about in this way.

Early in the spring of 1942 the Provost Marshal General was

directed to train a few hundred Army officers for military government duty in occupied territory. Someone had fished out of the files the lone manuscript copy of a report made by Colonel I. L. Hunt on our military government experience in Germany after the last war. Colonel Hunt had been the Officer in Charge of Civil Affairs in the part of Germany that was occupied by the American Army, and his report, when mimeographed and distributed, convinced a number of important military and civil officials that officers who were going to do civil affairs or military government work (the terms are synonymous) needed to study the subject. A School of Military Government was accordingly set up on the campus of the University of Virginia at Charlottesville to train these officers, and a little bit later a Military Government Division was established in the Office of the Provost Marshal General in Washington to recruit officers and assign them to training. From the beginning the two units worked in closest cooperation, and until March 1, 1943, when the Civil Affairs Division of the War Department General Staff was created, the Military Government Division and the School of Military Government had a monopoly on development of plans for military government.

One of the earliest determinations of this team was that Army officers assigned to civil affairs would have to be supported by small forces of military police under the command of commissioned and noncommissioned officers trained for the special problems of occupied territory. The training of these occupational police officers and noncoms was the task of the Military Government Division and therefore of its chief, Colonel Jesse I. Miller. Colonel Miller, a Washington, D. C. lawyer with a habit of working for the Government for nothing and a genius for getting other people to serve his client at the same price, helped organize the School of Military Government and then put on a uniform to head up the new Military Government Division. The establishment of the ASTP was big news at the moment when Colonel Miller took on the job of training top men for occupational police duty. With an eye out for a bargain the Colonel was calling on the Army Specialized Training Division (ASTD) in no time, proposing that a curriculum tailor-made for occupational police officers be included in the ASTP. When the Director of the ASTD recovered from the shock

(when before did any branch of the Army miss a chance to set up its own training school?), he accepted the challenge but on condition that Colonel Miller draw up his own curriculum. And so the bargain was struck for the training of 2000 enlisted men, the top half of whom would later enter Officer Candidate School, the remainder to become noncommissioned officers.

II

Colonel Miller knew what he wanted his soldiers to learn, but he wasn't sure that he knew how to maneuver college professors into teaching the things he wanted them to, instead of the things they were used to teaching. To help him bring the academicians into line, he went to the Bureau of the Budget and got himself a college professor (your reporter)—strictly on a loan basis.

The first step in working out the curriculum—defining the objectives of the training—was quickly done. The soldiers were to come out of the training with knowledge about the place likely to be occupied and the people who live there, ability to speak the principal language, and an understanding of the problems of an occupational police force. The problems of police administration are of no interest here for they have no particular significance for peacetime college education. It is the area and language instruction that is bound to make an impress on the postwar curriculum.

Important early decisions which controlled the details of curricula writing were: that the course should be planned for nine months, that most of the men would be trained for service in Japan or Germany, and that at least a handful of men would be prepared for any place where an American Army might conceivably take and hold territory. The planning of the language instruction presented no difficulty; the problem was dumped bodily in the lap of the American Council of Learned Societies. More truthfully, it was dumped in the lap of Mortimer Graves, Administrative Secretary of that organization. It was a case of a man with a mousetrap that looked better to the War Department than any other on the market. Long before this Graves had decided that Americans could learn foreign languages as readily as Europeans, and furthermore had made up his mind that America

needed a good supply of people who collectively could speak each of the important languages of the world.

To correct the national deficiency in language competence, Graves thought up, sold to his Council, and organized the Intensive Language Program. One of the foundations that hands out money for education put up enough for a comfortable working fund, and the smart and energetic Executive Secretary of the Linguistic Society of America, J Milton Cowan, was hired to whip the newly conceived Intensive Language Program into a going concern. Starting in 1941, by the fall of 1942 when Colonel Miller was planning his training program, the Intensive Language Program was under way in 18 colleges and universities, offering instruction in 25 languages, few of which had ever been taught in American colleges before.

The languages introduced to the American people in the Intensive Language Program were the ones which Graves in his armchair and Cowan in his Pullman berth figured lay square in the path of the American armies that were bound to move about the globe—Hausa (spoken by the natives about Dakar), Arabic (*lingua franca* from Morocco to Persia), modern Greek, Burmese, Malay, Thai, Japanese, Chinese, and 17 more. These were languages for which America had very few or no teachers; in French, German, Italian, and Spanish, we had long passed the pioneering stage and the colleges stood less in need of help.

The principles at the bottom of teaching in the Intensive Language Program were: concentrate on the fundamentals of the language and forget the refinements of the literature; get the student to think in the language he is studying and keep him from twisting it into the shape of the English he is used to; start with the spoken language and drill, drill, drill. This was exactly the kind of language teaching Colonel Miller wanted in his training program. Graves was made a consultant to the Military Government Division and Cowan a consultant to the ASTD and between them they wrote the best of the Intensive Language Program experience into the requirements for the ASTP Foreign Area and Language Curriculum—concentrate on the colloquial form of the language; explain the grammar when the effort to talk turns up something that needs to be explained; get the voice instruction from a

native, if at all possible; and practice talking and listening up to the point where fatigue dictates a rest.

This is the pattern of language instruction that went into effect in the ASTP Foreign Area and Language Curriculum, and it is the pattern that was followed slavishly in the Civil Affairs Training Program (CATP) to be described later. And it is the pattern of instruction that a great many teachers and educational leaders scattered all over the country expect to revolutionize language study and teaching in the future. But more about that later.

The foresight of Graves and his associates provided Colonel Miller with a big part of his training program ready made. No one had done a similar job for the other big part of his problem, "area characteristics." The significant knowledge about foreign peoples and the way they live is scattered through a dozen academic disciplines; the college professors had never gotten around to the job of integrating that subject matter into a single course of study. To do this job of selection and integration, Colonel Miller brought in as consultant Harold W. Stoke, now President of the University of New Hampshire but then Professor of Political Science and Acting Dean of the Graduate School at the University of Wisconsin. Stoke gathered around himself a half dozen men representing a wide range of interests in the study of contemporary civilizations and the group worked out a standard curriculum for the study of foreign areas.

Colonel Miller combined Stoke's statement with his language requirements and a course of study in police science and law enforcement systems, and so made up a curriculum for the training of his occupational police personnel. This document was adopted virtually without change by the Director of the ASTD and distributed to colleges and universities in the spring of 1943 as the course of study to be pursued in the Foreign Area and Language Study curriculum of the ASTP.

Colonel Miller's curriculum had a significance far beyond the value that lay in his blueprint for area and language instruction. It called not only for a demonstration of knowledge and teaching ability, but also for a display of imagination, cooperation, and capacity for management. "This program is unprecedented in college and university education," said Miller's document. "It is

urged most emphatically that the needs of this program cannot be met by courses or by sections of courses now being offered in the social science curricula of the colleges. Methods and materials of instruction must be devised to achieve the specific objectives of this training. . . . A special faculty group in each institution, including one of the language instructors, should be designated to plan the details of the program. Members of this group should be chosen for their enthusiasm for the program, competence for teaching, and inventiveness in the production and use of materials."

The announcement of the curriculum started a stampede among the colleges and universities of the country. Everyone wanted in on the training. Some, perhaps, were attracted only by the fact that it offered employment for a part of the faculty not otherwise used in Army and Navy programs, but many forward-looking educators grasped eagerly at the challenge to round up a team of faculty men who would reorganize and join together their knowledge in an effort to explain the important things about a place, a people, and a culture. Reviewing the plans for the training, the president of one of the country's leading universities said, "This is the kind of thing I've wanted to get started for years. I couldn't set up an experiment like this for \$100,000. We want this program even if it costs us that much money because it's worth that much to this university."

The curriculum attracted not only the educational world. The rest of the Army heard about it and within six months after Colonel Miller submitted the basic document, the 2000 men that he had asked to be trained were increased to 15,000 on demand of other branches of the service. The requirements for police science disappeared from the curriculum in most of the schools because not of value for the personnel in training, and the course became in most institutions strictly "area and language." The blueprint for language instruction, which was written by Graves and Cowan, stood essentially unaltered throughout the period of the training, but the requirements for area instruction underwent substantial changes. The original document submitted to the ASTD by Colonel Miller lingered on in the affections of the academic world, however, and at this moment supplies the basic features of the

area and language curriculum which many colleges and universities expect to make available to students after the war.

III

While all of this was going on, Colonel Miller had also to plan the training of officers for military government or civil affairs work. These officers, holding top positions, would direct the activities of the occupational police officers and noncoms trained in the ASTP. Some of these officers were in training at the School of Military Government at Charlottesville, but the capacity of that school was much too small for the need, and the Provost Marshal General, under Colonel Miller's direction, set up Civil Affairs Training Schools (CATS) in ten universities during the summer of 1943. These officers went first to an Army post for instruction in theory and practice of military government and then to the CATS for area and language and application of military government principles to the situation which would be encountered in the occupied area. This called for three or four months in the university if in training for service in Europe; six or seven months if destined to serve in the Far East.

The language requirements for this program were lifted bodily from the ASTP curriculum and the specifications for area study were Stoke's original blueprint with necessary modifications. The officers trained in the CATS were, of course, much more mature than the enlisted men in the ASTP, and many of them had records of genuine achievement in various professions and callings. This fact necessarily gave a twist to the area instruction in the CATS, resulting in much more emphasis on the industrial, commercial, and professional aspects of the area than was found in the ASTP schools.

All of this unprecedented development in the training of Army personnel had its counterpart in the Navy. Immediately after the start of the war, an enterprising group of the Columbia University faculty confronted naval authorities with a proposal to set up a school at Columbia for the training of Navy officers who would later be assigned to civil affairs duties in occupied territory. The Navy fell in with the proposition, accepted almost *in toto* the

curriculum proposed by the Columbia faculty, and gave its blessing to the Naval School of Military Government and Administration which Columbia set up. As in the two Army programs just discussed, the heart of the Columbia curriculum was intensive study of the foreign language and a thorough inquiry into the characteristics of the place where the officer would go and of the people he would deal with when he got there. In addition, a substantial amount of attention was given to policies and methods to be adhered to in administering occupied territory.

The Navy course was originally fixed at 48 weeks but later cut to 36, and the number of officers in training was usually somewhere between 100 and 150.

From the academic point of view the Navy school at Columbia was in several respects a better educational experience than either the ASTP program or the CATS. The Navy officers constituted undoubtedly the most capable and most serious bunch of students ever assembled in such numbers on one campus. The Navy was more liberal than the Army in letting the faculty have its way as to subjects to be covered. The length of the training period let the faculty pursue their subjects as far as their academic consciences dictated. But the Navy training was localized at Columbia University and its influence in the educational world was accordingly much more restricted than in the case of the ASTP and the CATS which together penetrated 57 different institutions.

IV

Such is the general nature of the wartime area and language courses and the story of how they came to be. The significance of these training programs for postwar education seems to be four-fold. They have taught us a lot about how to teach; they are likely to have a substantial effect on the content of the standard undergraduate curriculum; they give us a pattern for training Americans who look forward to careers in foreign places; and they supply a model for an important part of the instruction which we must give to students from all parts of the globe who will flock to America after the war.

1. *Lessons in How to Teach.* Certainly the most sensational

and probably the most significant demonstration in effective teaching which the area and language course supplied was the use of intensive methods in language instruction. The officers and enlisted men in these courses had a common purpose in studying the language—they wanted to learn to talk it. The motivation was strong—they expected to go abroad right away and they knew that command of the language was most important to their comfort if not their safety. These conditions were strong guarantors of the success of any sensible teaching and study method which might have been used. But the instruction in many of the schools achieved results far beyond the expectations of any except the most vigorous proponents of intensive methods.

A committee acting for the Modern Language Association of America made a study of teaching in the CATS and ASTP schools and reported that the results were "definitely good" but "not miraculous." This is entirely true. A "miraculous" thing is something that men cannot explain; it comes to be without the help of human beings. Graves, Cowan, and all the teachers who sweat blood to get these boys to speak and understand a foreign language in a few months know exactly how the results were achieved and they certainly had a hand in bringing them about. The phrase "definitely good" may be adequate for the mine run of the schools in the Army training; it is much too conservative a label for the results achieved in those schools that adhered most closely to the pattern of instruction and study outlined by Graves and Cowan. Experienced teachers of French, German, and Italian reported the surprise of their professional lives at the fluency and even nicety of expression achieved by many of these students in uniform. And the way hundreds of them learned to handle outlandish languages bearing little resemblance to the English to which they were born (Burmese, Thai, Japanese, for instance), and learned it from teachers and drill leaders who, in many cases, had never before attempted to teach the language—this was amazing even to students, teachers, and observers who had once learned a language in its native habitat under the intensive guidance of a personal tutor.

The extent to which these methods can be applied to language instruction in the traditional college course is right now the subject

of hot debate all over the country. The reasons for studying a language in peacetime are various—to be able to talk it, to read the literature with appreciation, to learn the words and phrases that have been incorporated into scientific and technical terminology. The multiplication of objectives and motives complicates the difficulties in teaching. Methods of teaching and study which enable the student to talk in a short time may not be so good if his objective is to learn how to read and write the language. It costs more money to teach a course intensively with a lot of drill in small groups than it does to drag the student through a semester of occasional recitations and a lot of individual study; on the other hand, if language study is tied up with other subjects in which the language is constantly used, it may turn out that learning the language takes care of itself after the essentials have been mastered. We will know about these things before very long for many institutions promise a variety of experiments.

The influence of the wartime courses on methods of instruction will undoubtedly extend far beyond language instruction. In the Navy School, in each of the CATS, and in many of the ASTP schools, a director of instruction was appointed and given sufficient authority to enable him to correlate all parts of the instruction and mold the entire teaching program into a compact and integrated course. This caused many a faculty man for the first time to consider seriously the relation of his teaching to that of his associates and to weigh the value of his contribution to the achievement of educational objectives. Under the critical eye and tongue of officers who felt their own merits and prestige equal to those of the faculty, not a few professors got told what was the net value of their lectures, and some of them suddenly acquired an open mind toward alternative ways of putting over facts and opinions. Panels, often including members of the student body, came in for frequent use. Conferences at which a small group of students could ask questions and venture opinions were prescribed as an important part of the curriculum in the CATS. Several of the schools made occasional or even frequent use of the informant; a refugee, a returned missionary, or a businessman who had surveyed an industry was put on the stand and a faculty member undertook to negotiate the transfer of his knowledge to the stu-

dent group. Many a faculty man for the first time set out to find movies or prepare an exhibit which would show the student what he found himself unable to put over in words. Some of the schools even took the student out into the metropolitan community to meet the nationality groups which he would later encounter, hoping in this way to give him his clearest picture of the people and culture he expected to live and work with later on.

In the CATS and in the Navy school it became clear at an early date that the officers would not credit the training with military importance unless the instruction was tied up closely with their future civil affairs work. Civil affairs teams (simulating a field headquarters staff) or other working groups were accordingly organized and assigned problems which the student-officers recognized as practical but which could only be solved by application of the knowledge which they were supposed to learn about the area. These devices not only won the officers over to the training; they gave the faculty a clear understanding of what the officer most needed to get from them.

Faculty people, in these ways, were introduced to a lot of methodology that was little tried, if not entirely new to them. Some of them claim to have learned a lot about making their teaching effective; whether on the whole their future teaching will show profit from this experience remains to be seen. And whether the fruits of their experience will penetrate to any large part of the faculty is problematical indeed.

2. *Better Ideas on What to Teach.* But wartime experience in area and language courses may contribute much more than methodology to college teaching. Forced to review and organize the important things that he knew about a foreign place and a foreign culture, many a faculty man came to realize that he had very little systematic knowledge about his own country. One cannot convey to officers and enlisted men the things they need to know about a foreign place and its inhabitants without arriving at some sense of what is important and significant in the life of a people. Most teachers who went through this process in the Army and Navy courses feel that they acquired a clearer vision of what is important and significant in our own environment and way of living, and they expect their teaching to profit from it for years to come.

Academic circles are continuously disturbed by the feeling that students ought to be introduced to an alien civilization, but they are everlastingly in despair of finding a way to do it. The University of Wisconsin, under Alexander Meiklejohn's leadership, attempted to guide the student through an exploration of a classic civilization, then through the systematic study of his own. St. John's College attempts to conduct him over the whole course of Western civilization, from ancient to contemporary times, by study of the principal cultural landmarks. No small number of academicians argue that the student ought to have at least a good look at an important contemporary culture differing in significant respects from our own—India and Indonesian civilization, China and the Chinese, The Moslem World. Such a study, they believe, would help him better to appreciate the qualities and values of his own ways of living. The area and language courses renewed interest in these ideas, won adherents to them, and clarified minds as to how the objective might be achieved.

One of our perennial problems in undergraduate teaching is to find a way of integrating in the mind of the student the different things that he studies in the course of his college career. We have tried orientation courses, senior seminars, and a dozen other devices, all designed to show the inter-relation of the different categories of learning. None of them satisfies very many of us very well. The area course may prove to be the ideal device for accomplishing this purpose. Imagine a group of seniors topping off their four years with a full semester devoted to the study of the region in which they are located—New England for one group of colleges; the Middle West for others; the South, the Mountain States, the West Coast for their respective institutions. All of the social sciences and most of the other studies will be brought into use. Who owns the land and the industries? What does the region produce? How is it organized to produce and distribute? What men or groups have power and to whom do they answer? Who supplies the civic leadership? What problems trouble those who look just a little way ahead of the rest? What other undertaking would more surely bring out what the student has learned, force a greater reliance on his tools for learning, or send him out into the world with a sharper realization of what the struggle is about?

3. *Training Americans for Careers Abroad.* Up to now, very little of American education has been specifically designed for the export trade. We have assumed that the student would make his living in the United States, and most of them have done so. Now we face the likelihood that many of our college graduates will launch their professional careers in foreign places—as engineers, as industrial specialists, in commercial establishments, in foreign service of the government, and in other capacities.

The war and the prospect of a world in much closer communication have set educators to planning curricula designed for an international service. These students must have first-class professional training. We hope they will acquire the necessary grace and lore for a gentleman's conversation. Will it not be wise also to give them, as we gave the prospective civil affairs officer, advance knowledge about the places and the people they expect to visit? Many college officials and teachers think so, and in planning instruction they are drawing heavily on wartime experience, particularly on the original ASTP curriculum which Colonel Miller presented to the War Department.

American industrial and commercial enterprises may call for training cut to order after the war, as the Army and Navy did while the war was on. In fact, more than one firm has already asked some college or university to outline a training program for its personnel in foreign posts. These courses may run for a few weeks or a few months. They may or may not include the study of a foreign language. Whatever kind of training the contract calls for, it may now be set down as certain that its basic character was presaged in the wartime area and language courses.

4. *Training of Foreign Students in America.* It is estimated that between 6500 and 7000 students came from foreign countries to study in American colleges and universities during the year 1943-1944. The number of foreign students has been steadily increasing over a period of years. It is inevitable that the number will sharply increase after the close of this war. The prestige of American military and productive power alone will draw them like a magnet. In addition, we are likely to pursue a positive policy designed to bring them into our schools. Indeed there are several hundred technically trained citizens of our allies in the United

States right now, studying American technological and production methods under arrangements sponsored by the American Government.

After a Chinese uprising against Westerners in 1900, we wrote off a major part of the indemnity to the United States by an arrangement whereby the Chinese Government paid the cost of educating a large number of Chinese students in the United States. This Boxer fund supplies an inviting pattern for the discharge of a good part of the lend-lease obligations to the United States. Neither China, nor Holland nor France (and for that matter, maybe no other recipient) can be expected to pay off in cash or goods the full amount of the advances we have made to them. Why not seek to offset some of those obligations by inviting the other nations concerned to educate a number of their young people in the United States?

Whether he comes on subsidy or not, the foreign student must learn to speak and to read the English language. He will want to learn something about our terrifying way of producing and distributing goods. He will also want to learn about our democratic system. The wartime foreign area and language course furnishes almost an ideal model for the first months of instruction for such students: The study of English by intensive methods; a thorough indoctrination in the ideology which causes us to value the interests of the common man and respect his judgment; a careful inquiry into the institutions and ways by which we seek to hold accountable those who have political power; a systematic examination of capitalism as it is practiced in America. Are these not the things we wish the students from abroad to learn about America? These are things that we now know how to teach as a result of the wartime foreign area and language course.

TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF WAR

By LLEWELLYN GROSS

University of Buffalo

One of the commonest interpretations of the cause of war is that war is the aggressive outcome of the frustration of basic human needs. It is the purpose of this paper to show the weaknesses of such an interpretation and to suggest directions in which we might more profitably look for understanding the problem of war.

The most recent authoritative presentation of the drive-frustration-aggression-war hypothesis is to be found in E. C. Tolman's book, *Drives Toward War*.¹ According to the author war is the aggressive outcome of the frustration of basic needs or appetites such as hunger, thirst, sex, maternal and nurturing drives, infantile dependence, nest building and using, general activity, exploratory, rest, elimination, and play drives. When these drives are frustrated the individual comes, through learning, to employ either self-assertive or collective techniques. The repression of self-assertion leads to sentimentality, self-punishment, crime, aggression against inferiors and war. Frustration of collective techniques leads to federation into larger groups and war.

Many difficulties bar the acceptance of the general theory. There is the difficulty of separating the primary or unlearned drives from the secondary or learned drives. Drives which are learned may be unlearned and should not be regarded as inalterable biological needs. It cannot be presumed that drives common to a group have a biological root unless their origin in glandular and neuromuscular structures has been demonstrated. How also is one to explain the antagonism (frustration?) of one drive to another, except in terms of the modifying influence of environmental pressures?

¹ Appleton-Century, New York, 1942. For a representative interpretation of the hypothesis in political science see H. J. Laski, *Where Do We Go From Here* (New York: Viking Press, 1940), pp. 76 ff.; also F. L. Schuman, *Design for Power* (New York: Knopf, 1943), pp. 290 ff.

Moreover, what is the referent of the term frustration? Is frustration an ineradicable state of the organism or is it the result of social conditioning? If the latter, it may be rendered ineffective by some kind of group therapy. Does it have its basis in muscular tension, visceral activity, conscious state, or in something else?¹ And what is the nature of its specific linkage with aggression? On what grounds can one imply a functional relationship between the number and intensity of the frustrations and the number and strength of the aggressions? There is some evidence from ethnology of an inverse relationship between these two—*i. e.*, when no means exist for preserving food and when excess wealth is nonexistent there is less war aggression. Doesn't frustration often eventuate into other forms of behavior than aggression such as rational problem solving, heightened suggestibility, stereotyped responses and regression?²

Similar questions may be raised about the concept "Aggression." When and where does it apply? Murphy has shown how aggression may have a great variety of direct and indirect expressions.³ In children it may show itself in attention getting devices such as grabbing toys, attacking younger siblings, refusing to comply, grumbling, etc. Adults may find outlet for aggressive urges in expressing authority over subordinates and children, over minority groups such as criminals and racial "inferiors," and in conventionalized games and prize fights. In order to determine the precise relationship between frustration and aggression the possible effects of physique, diet, fatigue, intelligence, etc., would have to be experimentally controlled.

Similarly, it is not an established fact that aggression may result in war. If we define war as "a simultaneous conflict of armed forces, popular feelings, jural dogmas, and national cultures so nearly equal as to lead to an extreme intensification of each,"⁴ then aggression may lead to activities similar to war but not iden-

¹ C. S. Hall, "Critical Review of Dollard, *et al.*; Frustration and Aggression," *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. II (November, 1940), p. 233.

² N. R. E. Maier, "The Role of Frustration in Social Movements," *Psychological Review*, Vol. 49 (November, 1942), pp. 586 ff.

³ G. Murphy, L. B. Murphy, and T. M. Newcomb, *Experimental Social Psychology* (New York, Harper and Bros., 1937), pp. 404-442.

⁴ Quincy Wright, *A Study of War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), Vol. II, p. 698.

tical with it. Such activities include interventions, reprisals, defensive expeditions, sanctions, armed neutralities, insurrections, rebellions, mob violence, piracy, and banditry.¹ Conversely, other factors than frustration or aggression may condition the occurrence of war. The more complex civilizations have had wars of religious proselytism fostered by group activity and ideology. Indeed, all organized fighting, whether of the tribal or national state, is subject to the institutional norms of technique, custom, ethics, and law.² Such wars may be only remotely related to the thwarting of elemental biological needs.

The many varieties of war cannot be explained in terms of the variation of the single quality: frustration.³ Here, as elsewhere, multiple causation is involved. Differences in results must be accounted for in terms of differences in underlying conditions.

II

A thorough knowledge of war calls for a knowledge of the people who carry on war. It calls for quantitative studies of the predominant traits or attributes of a people, including distribution curves of regions, classes, and significant subgroups within a nation, always oriented with reference to a particular period in time.⁴ For example, it would help to know *which* Germans are hardened and brutalized and in what ways and why, if we would rehabilitate them for peaceful living. Some Germans are supposed to be essentially romantic, to love folksongs, children, and toys.⁵ These should not be made to suffer. Information on motivation and cultural goals is needed. If part of the cause of Japanese aggression is, as Gorer maintains,⁶ the desire to establish themselves in the eyes of the outsiders, then more respect accorded

¹ Quincy Wright, *A Study of War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), Vol. I, p. 11.

² B. Malinowski, "An Anthropological Analysis of War," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 46 (January, 1941), pp. 501-557.

³ See H. Speier, "The Social Types of War," *Ibid.*, Vol. 46 (January, 1941), p. 452.

⁴ O. Klineberg, "A Science of National Character," *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 19 (February, 1944), pp. 147-162.

⁵ G. Murphy, "Psychology in the Making of Peace," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 38 (April, 1943), p. 134.

⁶ G. Gorer, "Themes on Japanese Culture," *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 5 (1943), pp. 106-124.

to them by other countries would seem a less expensive way of dealing with them than by war. If the Germans place greater value on objective principles and abstract ideals than on personal freedom, as Buhler claims,¹ then we should not be quite so indignant over their repression of freedom for minorities. What a group does not value for itself it cannot value for other people. National mentalities are not molded to a single logic. One cannot successfully appeal to a principle of justice like the golden rule when dealing with nations whose people think primarily in terms of economic gain and use ethics as a rationalization of it. One gets nowhere by emphasizing the point that the Germans put the state prior to the individual when they (the Germans) deny the very necessity of such a dichotomy. The appeal of individual freedom is senseless to a mentality which sees order, discipline, and authority as means to the "ultimate realization of self in the larger whole."²

Confusion over the character of war is augmented by the ambiguity of the language of common speech. It is hard to find two people who are in complete agreement on the use of such words as freedom, equality, supranational sovereignty. For example, one may mean by equality that all men have equivalent heredity, or that all men have the same social opportunities, or that all men should be given the same opportunities, or that all men of the same age and ability should be given the same opportunity, or that all men have the same freedom under government. Laymen, journalists, public officers should be educated to understand the more elementary principles in the growing subject of semantics as expounded by Korzybski, Carnap, Ogden and Richards, Chase, Hayakawa, and others. They should understand that symbols are socially defined representations separate from the events for which they stand; that any single word usually has a plural meaning and plural emotional connotations; that no word can denote all the characteristics of what it is used to represent, since its

¹ C. Buhler, "Why do Germans So Easily Forfeit Their Freedom," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 38 (April, 1943), pp. 149-158.

² L. W. Fuller, "The War of 1914 as Interpreted by German Intellectuals," *Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 14 (June, 1942), p. 153. This statement is, of course, an oversimplification. Cf. J. Dewey, *German Philosophy and Politics*, C. Putnam's, 1942.

meaning at any one time is subject to the limitations of the context in which it is used; that the alternatives posed by language may not be realizable in practice. An awareness of this kind has its advantages. It prevents overeasy simplification and generalization of perceptual patterns such as "Americans are industrious," "Negroes are sensuous," "Japanese are cruel." The assimilation of these stereotypes discourages the habit of intellectual and emotional discrimination so essential to the adequate functioning of present day society. If one stops to ask himself of the possible uses of a term one has at least begun to think! It fastens an attitude of skepticism toward all individuals who make easy banter of the shibboleths of folk language. It encourages those forms of leadership which are inimical to provincialism and demagoguery in government.

There is the confusion caused by the presence of divergent frames of reference (assumptions, patterns of perception, standards of value) within the same community. How can one establish common ground between the militarist and the pacifist? Anyone familiar with Hartmann's recent study of philosophic arguments for and against pacifism must certainly feel the almost insurmountable difficulty of establishing unity in points of view among experts.¹ Yet is not unity of viewpoint the best guarantee of unstinted efforts for peace?

War has its roots in a matrix of favorable attitudes toward it. From early childhood the individual is trained to respect and emulate national heroes; he comes to experience the thrill of the military parade and to live through movie and popular story the daring deeds of the patriots. These attitudes are reinforced by the ethnocentric habit of judging alien peoples in accordance with one's own cultural norms. Such values develop into national prejudice by maintaining barriers against the ego's identification with a world community. The problem of ethnocentrism and identification, of extending the boundaries of the ego from the neighborhood community to the world community, must be faced squarely if we are to have a lasting peace. Knowledge of the range of cultural dif-

¹ G. W. Hartmann, "The Strength and Weakness of the Pacifist Position as Seen by American Philosophers," *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 53 (March, 1944), pp. 125-145.

ferences would seem to be essential. Only through such a study can the layman come to know and appreciate the attempts made—adequate in their own way—by different peoples at different times and places to solve the ever present problem of maintaining life. One should see his own social system against a background of other social systems. To say that one society is better or worse than other societies is to presume a knowledge of these other societies. Likewise, the lay reader would see more readily the relationship between the way in which an individual acts (*i. e.*, what he says and does) and the actions of the society or group in which he lives. This relativity of behavior would make him conscious that in differences, *per se*, there is no superiority.

An understanding of war calls for a theory of historical change in order to provide a framework in terms of which one can collect data on war. One cannot start with simple pure facts but must begin with vague general observations which set the limits and range of the data to be worked with. Through a process of selection and analysis facts are gathered and sifted, hypothesis merges into theory, and theory into scientific law. One may see war as a concomitant variation of certain events which if present lead inevitably to the expected result; or as an evolutionary stage in the emergence of a higher form of civilization; or as an ideal type, the outgrowth of a pattern of factors in special relation to one another; or as merely an expression of the capricious and contingent in human life. What is significant is that one should have a theory of history in terms of which one can account for the phenomenon of war. Without it any interpretation of responsibility is naïve. Without it one can have no idea of how wars originate and only an imperfect conception of how they may be controlled.

Supplementary to a theory of history is knowledge of how to plan for the control of war. Here we have the problem of preventing the occurrence of war and of determining the means to eliminate or alter the course of war after its inception. The two problems are not necessarily synonymous since the forces which deflect the course of incipient warfare may not be the ones which initiate it. There is the difficulty of evaluating means against means and means against ends. It will have to be shown, to those who doubt, that the means used to prevent war are less costly, eco-

nomically and socially, than the means used to terminate it and that the ends of peaceful living are more rewarding than is war.

To summarize, then, understanding of the problem of war cannot be found in the frustration-aggression hypothesis. It is to be found in more knowledge of national character and of the attitudes and values which engender war; in the use of a more exact language of social events and in the development of a clearer conception of the means by which wars originate and may be controlled.

WHY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS WEAR OUT¹

By HIRAM HAYDN

The United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa

A few years ago, speaking at a large dinner, the president of an American university gravely remarked, "The average life of a college president is four years."

This statement was not just an epigram. While I have not checked the exact figures, I am sure that the terms of college and university presidents do not average much over five years. The "lifetime" president, who benignly surveys the passing of five or more undergraduate generations, is much rarer than he used to be. In recent years we have been witnessing the end of an era of "elder statesmen." Most of them have served their particular institutions and education in general; but the present trend seems to be away from long-term administrations.

This is one of the contributory factors to a surprising situation: the existence of some sixty vacancies among American college and university presidencies. There are other factors, of course—an unusually large number of deaths in the ranks; the unrest that attends a period of transition; the fact that some of the college presidents who have been doing double duty during the war, on the campus and in Washington, have been won away from the academic world.

But whatever the causes, an unprecedented number of searches are now being made for the "right man." Boards of trustees, alumni committees, and faculty committees are examining long lists of potential candidates and are paying elegantly surreptitious visits to the offices and homes of those best qualified to give them information about one or more of the men and women listed. Sanguine and uneasy and radiant candidates are being en-

¹ Reprinted through the courtesy of the *New York Times Magazine* (September 16, 1945).

tertained at luncheons and teas, where everybody pretends that nothing special is going on—simply a delightful social function.

The process is exhaustive and exhausting for all involved. One trustee of a New England college said to me when his group had finally made its selection after a year's hunt, "Compared to this business, my law practice is a cinch. I've got to take a vacation."

One thing is certain—the decision can seldom be made rapidly. There are few jobs more demanding, or requiring a more bewildering versatility, than that of an academic presidency. During the war the pressure on administrators as well as faculties was tremendous: all-year-round schedules under accelerated programs; a scarcity of teachers in some places, a superfluity in others; the necessarily painful adjustment to new kinds of courses demanded by Army and Navy requirements; the adoption of exhaustive war-time programs to serve the Government, only to have the whole program abandoned in a year or two, and many other new and complicated problems.

Nor has the end of the war meant much of a lightening of the presidential load. Reconversion is nearly as serious a hurdle in education as in industry. The effective administration of the G. I. Bill of Rights will be a colossal task in itself. And the nation-wide concern over new curricula appropriate to our probable postwar needs and aims has resulted in radical changes—changes affecting courses, personnel, general administration.

But even in normal times (whatever they are) it is a formidable job. There is probably no such thing as an average day in a college president's life, but if there were it might read something like this:

7:30—Rises.

8:00—Breakfast.

8:30—Tries to pacify Professor Jones, who has telephoned to complain that he has not been appointed to the Humanities' subcommittee of the Post-War Curriculum Faculty Committee which serves jointly with the Alumni Post-War Curriculum Committee in preparing a program to be presented to the Trustee Post-War Curriculum Committee.

9:05—Arrives at office five minutes late. Finds Dean Penny-whistle waiting for a 9 o'clock appointment to discuss the question of the applications of five students for permission to be excused from physical education.

- 9:30—Reads morning mail. It contains two flat refusals to provide needed special funds—from hitherto unfailing alumni contributors. Also an invitation to speak next Friday at a neighboring woman's college on the Higher Values of the Liberal Arts. (He is an engineer. Friday is his one day for golf, but reasons of state demand that he accept the invitation.) Also a welter of annoying trivia—which must be answered. Also his son's boarding school report card, displaying several D's.
- 9:45—Dictation.
- 10:30—Appointment with prominent alumnus, who is displeased with showing of last fall's football team, and demands action and a new coach.
- 11:30—Conference with the budgetary pundits over unexpected expenses.
- 12:30—Luncheon at the Kiwanis Club. Addresses food-heavy audience on "Education for Americanism."
- 2:15—Appointment with Professor Wigglesworth, chairman (and only member) of the Department of Philosophy, who feels that philosophy is being discriminated against in favor of more vulgarly utilitarian courses.
- 3:00—Interview with student committee to consider advisability of imposing heavier faculty censorship upon student newspaper.
- 4:15—Conference with admissions officers on enrollment problem.
- 5:00—Fifth of series of seven faculty teas, in Jenks Memorial Hall. Stands in receiving line for one hour and twenty minutes, beside Mrs. Thermidor, wife of the president-emeritus. Mrs. Thermidor is deaf and feels that her husband's pension is insufficient.
- 6:30—Escapes to home, and finds cold meal awaiting him. Maid's day off and wife does not permit him a cocktail, since she is due in half hour at Faculty Square Dancing Association meeting.
- 7:00—Prepares introduction for evening's speaker at Dumpworth Memorial Hall.
- 7:30—Introduces Harold J. Stentorian of neighboring university, speaking on "Some Rare Flora of Costa Rica." Stentorian addresses audience of twenty-seven for an hour and a half.
- 9:00—Entertains Professor Stentorian and other flora lovers—serving ginger ale and Lorna Doones.
- 10:30—Finds that maid forgot to order beer. Discusses domestic problems with wife, who is disappointed over not being elected vice president of Faculty Square Dancing Association, and attributes defeat to Mrs. Oblique, wife of professor

who did not succeed to headship of English Department, as expected.

11:30—Bed, but not sleep.

Why, then, does anyone want to be a college president? Some, I suppose, are ambitious for the prestige. Some find the salary pleasant. The figures are not usually available to the uninitiated, but presidencies are at least the highest paid educational job—or are supposed to be. I am remembering the story about the university president whose salary was raised from \$10,000 to \$17,500 because the news got out that the football coach was being paid \$15,000.

Then there must be some who really enjoy the work and the life it entails. Presumably there are happy bank tellers, floor walkers, dentists. It is equally logical that there shall be happy college presidents.

But whatever the variety of rewards, it is no greater than the variety to be found in the kinds of men who become college presidents. There is no obvious common denominator. There are round, ruddy, jolly ones; thin, scholarly, ascetic ones; elegant and urbane ones; shaggy, unkempt ones who look like philosophical sheep dogs; keen, alert ones; obvious leaders—and of all ages, sizes and capacities.

Yet, despite these many variations, almost all college presidents fall roughly (some more roughly than others) into one of three classifications: those who are born college presidents, those who achieve college presidencies, and those who have college presidencies thrust upon them.

The born college or university president is a man or woman with an unlimited amount of patience; a nice sense for the balance between personal ambition and the dedication to cause; a sufficient sense of humor to digest his dinner after a meeting with a recalcitrant faculty member, a professional alumnus, or an active (which, off the record, means domineering) trustee—and yet not enough to find unbearable the rhetorical claptrap of commencement exercises. He should be tolerant, but not too tolerant; just but not squeamish; urban but not sophisticated. He should be enough of a business man to know what the members of his board of trustees are talking about, but not enough of one to think of his institution

as primarily a business venture. He should be enough of a scholar and teacher to know good ones when he meets them, but not enough to be a first-rate one himself.

Such men are as rare as four-leaf clovers in Times Square. Yet every board of trustees dreams of securing one, and hope springs eternal—witness one large university which is at present considering ninety-five candidates for its presidency.

The second class—the achievers—is mostly composed of those who rise from the ranks—slowly, doggedly, consciously. When the first opportunity comes to stop teaching and become a director of admissions or a secondary dean, these people self-admittedly face a tragic decision—that between pursuing further the teaching “that they love” and accepting the administrative post “from a feeling of obligation to the college.” Obligation usually wins, and wins, and wins.

It’s a long climb, and they are apt to be tired by the time they reach the top (of course, many of them don’t), but they are often welcome for exactly this reason. A college or university which has just suffered from a radical or spendthrift or tactless administrator is grateful for the quiet, cautious sort whose every move can be predicted ten years in advance.

There are two outstanding classes of those who have presidencies thrust upon them. One is the brilliant young man who, at an age when his contemporaries are hoping for a junior partnership or a residency in a hospital within five years, is suddenly drafted to revolutionize the curriculum and devastate the coeds. Sometimes (there is at present one notable example in the Middle West) he fulfills the promise of his early brilliance and ends by devastating the faculty. Sometimes he doesn’t.

The other class consists of men who have had no formal connection with any educational institution since their own undergraduate days, but who are called in from the practice of law or business or politics—or even war. (There is a rumor current that there is not a single four-star general who is not under consideration at one institution or another.)

For the benefit of those who are considering achieving college presidencies or having them thrust upon them (it is futile to advise the “born” type), we must delay no longer a discussion of that

basic problem concerning the college president's wife. The few times that inquiries concerning a possible candidate for a presidency have come to me, there has been one unfailing question: "What do you know about his wife?"

This question can prove very embarrassing, especially if you are as naïve as I was the first time I was asked. The wife in question was a delightful human being—attractive, as enthusiastic about the company of men as of women, a good, healthy, but not overly solicitous mother, the intellectual equal of her husband, and a hater of pretense, hypocrisy and receiving lines. In my incredible ingenuousness I told all this, happily and at length. I later learned that her husband had stood a good chance until my interview.

No, if you are certain—through one dark presage or another—that you are likely to become a college president, be as cautious and circumspect about your marriage as possible. Choose someone two or three years younger than yourself, someone with a plain but not unpleasant face that can be described as "really quite attractive when it lights up." Brownish hair will be the best, and a modest figure. If possible, it will be well to acquire someone who can say, "No, I haven't read it, but I saw a review of it the other day," without blinking. She must look as though she were accustomed to sitting at a dinner party table, but not as though she were accustomed to being looked at. She should play a moderate hand of bridge, be able to remember names after hearing them once, know how to arrange flowers and have the sort of nose that will accommodate itself easily to pince-nez in later years.

Of course, it isn't true—any of it. During the last several years I have visited more presidential homes than in all the rest of my life. I have found—as soon as the other guests departed, or the particular ceremony was over—that I was the guest of men and women variously but consistently intelligent, charming, genuine and hospitable. I have watched "front office" masks being lifted; I have heard a college president's wife say "Thank God!" as she sprawled out in a chair; I have watched a college president remove his coat, revealing rich red suspenders, and heard him say dreamily, "Now, how about a drink?"

But all the same, it's an awful price to pay for the honor or dignity or prestige—or salary. One variant on "I'd rather be right

than president" which has a special poignancy for me is "You can't be right if you're president." At least, you can't be right all the time to all of your constituents—or clients, or whatever they are. For there are at least five powerful groups of them, any three of which would be enough to kill an ordinary man in those four years of presidential expectancy.

I list them in what I suspect is usually their degree of formidability: the board of trustees (by whatever name . . .), the alumni or alumnae, the local or State citizenry (in State institutions—educational ones—this group frequently takes precedence over graduates), the faculty, and the students. If the order of my listing is a subversive commentary on American education, make the most of it. Or ask a college president.

At random, I think of a few individuals and situations: of a liberal and generous man who fought it out for five years before being overwhelmed by a reactionary and bigoted constituency; of the smiling little round man who at 70 broke up a student riot by inviting in for tea and cookies all the three hundred who had ferociously stormed his front yard; of the only college president out of two hundred and fifty whose institutions were affiliated with a denominational board who had the courage and integrity to refuse to apply a discriminatory statute against faculty members who did not formally profess a Protestant Evangelical faith; of a great scholar who fled after two years in the president's chair—back to scholarship.

No, it's no sinecure, at ten or twenty thousand a year—or even at fifty thousand. And before you decide to accept whichever one of the sixty vacancies is offered to you, I suggest that you take stock of your fortitude—and of your wife's. Your fortitude, your sense of humor, and your sheer endurance.

CONCERNING THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Excerpts from the Council Record

Among the items on the agenda of the meeting of the Council of the American Association of University Professors, held in Chicago, Illinois on May 18-19, 1945, was the consideration of recent and current difficulties at the University of Texas involving issues of academic freedom and tenure. The meeting of the Council was preceded by a meeting of the Active Members of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure at which the evidence in the University of Texas situation was reviewed and recent developments in the situation carefully considered.

In reporting to the Council on the University of Texas situation, Dr. Edward C. Kirkland, Chairman of the Association's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure, directed the Council's attention to the following portions of his Annual Report for the Committee for 1944.

... Whatever the war settlement may do for international affairs, it will not give definite answer to the character of our domestic economy. The long debate on that issue was adjourned by the war. With its end, it will resume. Professors in history, economics, government, sociology, and in other fields will have convictions as to what is feasible and what is desirable; they will express these convictions. Both the opinions and their expressions are bound to displease some warriors fighting in the arena where things get done. With such issues at stake and with an impaired perspective due to the war, it is not unlikely that the reaction will be a demand for conformity and with it attempts to suppress academic "heresy."

It is such considerations which make the recent events in Texas so foreboding. Readers of newspapers and magazines and of the *Bulletin* know, of course, that the Regents of the University have recently dismissed the president of that institution.¹ They will

¹ See interim report, "Academic Freedom and Tenure at the University of Texas," Winter, 1944 *Bulletin*.

also recall that two years ago three instructors in the economics department were not reappointed after they had pointed out in the press that a "patriotic mass meeting" at Dallas to arouse the citizenry against a Federal law "which says a man should work only 40 hours per week" was protesting against a statute which did not exist. The national wages and hours act does not in fact prohibit more than forty hours of labor a week; it provides for the payment of overtime for hours above that maximum. For this attempt at public enlightenment the three lost their jobs. An appeal was made to the Association. This autumn at a public meeting of the Regents the General Secretary of our Association not only advised the reinstatement of the discharged instructors but forcefully presented the case for academic freedom and the reasons for the Association's interest in it. A few days later the Regents dismissed President Rainey. Since then the General Secretary has appeared before the Texas Senate Committee on Education investigating the general situation at the University. The Association has also cooperated with other educational organizations interested in the observance at the University of Texas of those standards of academic freedom and tenure generally observed in institutions of good repute. Only future investigations and development can demonstrate whether the Texas turmoil is but another milestone along the disastrous path once trod by North Dakota Agricultural College, the University of Mississippi, and the University of Georgia, or whether it is the portent of a new and dangerous future in which pressure groups influence governing boards, which in turn seek to control what is taught by the faculties of educational institutions.

Following Dr. Kirkland's remarks Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, General Secretary of the Association, reviewed the evidence in the University of Texas situation including that adduced in the testimony presented to the Texas Senate Committee on Education during the investigation of the University situation conducted by that body last November. He also reported on subsequent developments evidenced in letters from members of the Faculty of the University of Texas and others including a letter from Dr. Theophilus S. Painter, Acting President of the University, in which Dr. Painter submitted for consideration a communication carrying the names of a number of members of the Faculty of the University. Apropos of these data, Dr. Himstead said that they were being included in the record of the total situation for further consideration. With reference to the dismissal of the

three instructors of Economics, he said, "There is no dispute between the Board of Regents of the University of Texas and the American Association of University Professors concerning the facts with reference to these three dismissals . . . it is the unanimous opinion of the Active Members of Committee A that these three dismissals constituted a serious violation of the principles of academic freedom."

Following a discussion of the reports of Drs. Kirkland and Himstead, the Council adopted the following statement:

The Council of the American Association of University Professors is gravely concerned about the situation at the University of Texas as revealed in the interim report "Academic Freedom and Tenure at the University of Texas," published in the Winter, 1944 issue of the Association's *Bulletin*, and as further revealed by the Chairman of the Association's Committee A and the General Secretary of the Association with reference to: (1) The dismissal of three instructors of Economics for reasons concerning which the facts are not in dispute and which make it clear that this action by the Board of Regents of the University of Texas cannot, in accordance with good academic practice, be justified, and (2) the subsequent summary dismissal of Dr. Homer P. Rainey from the Presidency of the University for reasons which the evidence available to the Association at this juncture also indicates cannot be justified in accordance with good academic practice.

Upon the completion of the investigation of the University of Texas situation and the publication of the final report, the Council will consider whether or not there should be formal censure of the Administration of the University of Texas. In the meantime, the members of the Council wish to express to the members of Committee A deep appreciation of their efforts to bring about amicable adjustments of the difficulties at the University of Texas and of their painstaking labors in seeking clarification of the facts of these difficulties for the information of the profession and the public—an appreciation which they are confident is shared by the representatives of education and the friends of education throughout the country.

At the conclusion of the consideration of the University of Texas situation, Dr. Kirkland indicated that, barring unforeseen developments, Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure

expects to complete the investigation of the University of Texas situation by the end of the year or early in 1946.

Action by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

Pursuant to action of the Executive Council of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Chairman of the Commission appointed on November 9, 1944 a committee "to investigate conditions at the University of Texas involved in the dismissal of President Homer P. Rainey by the Regents of the University on November 1, 1944."¹ On July 13, 1945, the Committee submitted a report of its findings to the Commission and made the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the University of Texas be placed on probation until such time as the Association is assured of the full observance of its principles and standards.

This recommendation was endorsed by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the Association and presented to the Executive Committee of the Association at a meeting on July 22, 1945 held in Memphis, Tennessee. At this meeting the following motion was passed unanimously:

. . . that the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, through the Executive Committee, receive and approve the report presented by the Commission on Higher Institutions, and place the University of Texas on probation, effective as of this date, and continuing until such time as the Association is assured of the full observance of its principles and standards.²

¹ Personnel of Investigating Committee: Herman L. Donovan, President of the University of Kentucky, *Chairman*; M. C. Huntley, Dean of Administration of the University of Alabama; Theodore H. Jack, President of Randolph-Macon Women's College; W. W. Pierson, Dean of the Graduate School of the University of North Carolina; Rufus C. Harris, President of Tulane University.

² *The Southern Association Quarterly*, August, 1945, page 404.

EDUCATION AND THE PEACE

A REPORT ON DEVELOPMENTS RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZA- TION FOR EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL COOPERATION

To the Members of the Association:

Throughout the war the representatives and friends of education in the United States and other democratic countries, particularly in Great Britain, have concerned themselves with measures designed to preserve educational and cultural values and to further the development of education in the postwar world. Since the defeat of Germany their efforts have been directed toward the establishment of an effective international organization for intellectual cooperation. The materials that follow are explanatory of this development. It is hoped that they will be studied carefully, discussed in group meetings, and given the widest possible dissemination.

In preparation for the United Nations Conference on International Organization held in San Francisco, California (April 25-June 26, 1945), the Department of State of the United States extended invitations to 42 national organizations representative of agriculture, business, labor, and education to send representatives to the Conference to advise with the United States Delegation. Each organization was permitted to have one consultant and two associates. Among the organizations invited was the American Council on Education of which the American Association of University Professors is a constituent member.

The viewpoints of the representatives of these several organizations were brought to bear upon the work of the Conference in frequent meetings of the consultants with members of the United States Delegation with reference to particular sections of the Charter of the United Nations under consideration. Consultants for the American Council on Education were Dr. George F. Zook,

President of the Council, and Dr. Herman B. Wells, President of Indiana University and Chairman of the Council. Dr. Zook's report of the Conference, issued to the membership of the Council on July 16, follows:

Education at the United Nations Conference on International Organization

By George F. Zook

In order to secure a definite basis for action at the San Francisco Conference a questionnaire was distributed, April 24, 1945, to the delegates of the 59 constituent members of the American Council on Education. In a short time replies had been received from the delegates of 34 members, favoring the establishment of an international office of education and cultural relations and approving provision for such an organization at the San Francisco Conference in case provision was made for similar international organizations in other fields such as health and labor.

Prior to the Conference the Executive Committee of the Council adopted the following statement:

In accordance with opinions expressed in ballots from representatives of 59 constituent organizations belonging to the American Council on Education, the Executive Committee of the Council, meeting in Washington, May 4, 1945, strongly urges the American Delegation at the San Francisco Conference to support specific provision for an international office of education and cultural relations as an integral part of an international organization. Provision for this office will give due recognition both to the importance of cultural interchange in the maintenance of world peace and to the rôle of education in promoting this interchange. It will, moreover, avoid the great confusion which for twenty years prior to the outbreak of the present war has resulted from the division between two international organizations of responsibilities for the closely related fields of education and intellectual co-operation.

Copies of this resolution were sent to each member of the American Delegation at San Francisco. Many other communications were sent by other organizations and individual institutions

of higher education and school systems to the members of the United States Delegation.

Background. The Covenant of the League of Nations made no provision for international cooperation in cultural or educational matters. In 1921, however, there was set up under the League of Nations the International Commission on Intellectual Cooperation. Originally the Commission was conceived of as the International Commission on Intellectual and Educational Cooperation. Some of the originators of the Commission felt, however, that the word "intellectual" included all aspects of "education" and hence the latter word was dropped from the title. Owing to very restricted financial resources the Commission and its executive arm, the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, established in Paris in 1925, performed noteworthy but necessarily limited services of an educational nature during the period between the two world wars. The United States was, of course, not a member of the League, but it was represented on the Commission through a voluntary national committee set up in this country.

In the meantime there was founded at Geneva in 1925 the International Bureau of Education which, with limited financial resources, devoted itself exclusively to educational services of an international nature. The United States was not a member of the Bureau, but representative American educators frequently attended the annual international conferences which it held in Geneva.

The inadequate support of international educational activities and the division of the function between two international organizations contributed in no small measure to the growing demand in this country for an effective and coordinated International Office of Education and Cultural Cooperation.

Prior to the calling of the San Francisco Conference a considerable amount of attention had been given to this matter in London by a number of Ministers of Education, chiefly from the occupied countries. Since April, 1944 the U. S. State Department, through a special delegation to London and in other ways, has given extended consideration to a possible international organization in the field of educational and cultural relations, which if realized

would have something of the same independent status as the International Labor Office.

Dumbarton Oaks Proposals for a General International Organization. The original Dumbarton Oaks proposals agreed to by the delegations of the United Kingdom, Russia, the United States, and China, contained no reference to the place and function of education or cultural relations in the proposed world organization. The nearest reference to anything in this area was contained in Chapter IX, as follows:

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, the Organization should facilitate solutions of international economic, social, and other humanitarian problems and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Responsibility for the discharge of this function should be vested in the General Assembly and, under the authority of the General Assembly, in an Economic and Social Council.

The Economic and Social Council should be empowered:

- (a) to carry out, within the scope of its functions, recommendations of the General Assembly;
- (b) to make recommendations, on its own initiative, with respect to international economic, social, and other humanitarian matters;

The Economic and Social Council should set up an Economic Commission, a Social Commission, and such other Commissions as may be required.

Failure to recognize specifically the importance of international educational or cultural relations in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals was naturally a source of keen disappointment to educational leaders in the United States, who thereupon determined if possible to repair this omission at the San Francisco Conference.

The Chapultepec Agreement. Shortly before the San Francisco Conference the representatives of 20 American Republics at the Inter-American Conference at Chapultepec in Mexico signed an agreement which contained the following provision:

The desirability of creating an international agency specially charged with promoting intellectual and moral cooperation between nations;

It was therefore reasonable to suppose that the representatives of the various American governments would favor some kind of a provision in this field in the international charter under consideration at the San Francisco Conference.

The Chinese Amendment. On April 25, 1945 Secretary Stettinius announced that the four inviting powers had agreed to three amendments to the text of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The third amendment urged by the Chinese delegation read as follows:

The Economic and Social Council should specifically provide for the promotion of educational and other forms of cultural cooperation.

Naturally the representatives of the educational organizations serving as consultants at the San Francisco Conference were immensely encouraged at the prospect of specific mention of "educational" cooperation in the international charter. They were much gratified that the Chinese had taken the initiative in such a forward step in international relations.

Amendments Suggested by Other Nations. Early in the San Francisco Conference the delegates of the other nations also submitted a number of amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. A considerable number of them suggested that to the functions of the Economic and Social Council be added "cultural," "intellectual," and/or "educational" cooperation. Several, including Ecuador, Haiti, Norway, the Philippines, Lebanon, and Uruguay, urged specific provisions of one kind or another for education in the proposed charter.

Amendments Proposed Jointly by the Four Great Powers, May 5, 1945. One can easily imagine the surprise and disappointment of the consultants from the educational organizations when on May 5, 1945 the four great powers proposed a number of amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals omitting specific mention of education, as follows (the amendments are *italicized*):

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations *based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples*, the Organization should facilitate

solutions of international economic, social, *cultural*, and other humanitarian problems and promote respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms *for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex*. Responsibility for the discharge of this function should be vested in the General Assembly, and under the authority of the General Assembly, in an Economic and Social Council.

The Economic and Social Council should be empowered:

To make recommendations for promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms;

To make recommendations, on its own initiative with respect to international economic, social, *cultural*, and other humanitarian matters;

To receive and consider reports from the economic, social, *cultural*, and other organizations or agencies (such as the International Labor Office) brought into relationship with the Organization, and to coordinate their activities through consultations with, and recommendations to, such organizations or agencies.

The Economic and Social Council should set up *Commissions in the fields of economic activity, social activity, cultural activity, promotion of human rights and any other fields within the competence of the Council*.

Letter of Secretary Stettinius to the Consultants of the Educational Organizations, May 8, 1945. On May 8 Secretary Stettinius wrote to President Herman B. Wells, Consultant for the American Council on Education, acknowledging a letter dated May 2 from the consultants of the four educational organizations, as follows:

This letter urges "the importance of including specific arrangements for international cooperation in education and cultural development in the charter of the United Nations Organization." The American Delegation has carefully considered this matter, and I feel sure that you will be pleased to know that the amendments acceptable to the American Delegation include specific reference in Chapter IX, of cultural cooperation between the members of the International Organization. The term "cultural cooperation" is understood by the delegation to include educational, as well as other, interests of a cultural nature.

Your letter further states that "The United Nations Charter should specifically state the intent to establish, as one of the semi-autonomous agencies operating within the framework of the

Economic and Social Council, an international office of education and cultural development." This matter, too, has been carefully considered and cultural organizations are specifically mentioned, in the draft of amendments acceptable to the American Delegation, as among the specialized organizations and agencies which "should be brought into relationship with the Organization" upon mutually agreeable terms.

I trust that you and your respected cosigners will find this explanation satisfactory, even though the reference to education is inclusive rather than explicit. The effort has been made to use broad covering terminology and thus to avoid enumerating, not merely education, but a whole series of subjects like science, art, libraries, etc., that would be essentially limiting in subsequent interpretation.

Shortly thereafter the Committee on Economic and Social Cooperation of the Conference approved the phraseology of this section of the proposed international charter, using the word "cultural" in several places substantially as recommended by the four great powers. It was understood, so the chairman of the Conference committee stated, that the word "cultural" included "educational" factors. At this point the battle to secure specific mention of the word and the function of "education" in the proposed charter seemed lost.

Cooperation with Consultants of Other Organizations. In the meantime conferences among consultants representing the *agricultural, business, education, and labor groups* on matters of mutual interest had been in progress. The results of these conferences were communicated to all of the consultants on May 15, which received the evidence of cooperation among these four groups with great enthusiasm.

A formal statement embodying specific recommendations was presented to the entire United States Delegation at 8:30 A.M. on May 17, accompanied by brief oral presentations from representatives of the four groups. Upon realizing that they were faced with a joint request from these four powerful groups, one of the members of the United States Delegation threw up his hands, saying, "I surrender!"

The two chief recommendations of the four groups were:

1. The addition of a new paragraph to the functions of the Economic and Social Council as follows:

"The Economic and Social Council and its Commissions should from time to time arrange conferences with and receive recommendations from major non-governmental organizations, national and international, which are concerned with matters within the competence of the Council. For this purpose members of the Organization may establish national advisory boards composed of representatives of such major non-governmental organizations. Recommendations made under this paragraph should be made public by the Council."

2. Wherever the word "cultural" was used in the functions and organization of the Economic and Social Council, it should read "cultural and educational."

Reconsideration and Success! The members of the United States Delegation gave immediate and serious consideration to the proposals of the four groups. Dr. Virginia C. Gildersleeve, with the approval of her associates from the American Delegation, proposed to the Conference Committee dealing with the Economic and Social Council that one of the functions of the Council be amended to read as follows (new material *italicized*):

"to promote *educational and* cultural cooperation."

Although the committee had previously accepted only the word "cultural," it promptly, May 22, reconsidered its previous action and approved the proposed rewording of the United States Delegation unanimously.

The paragraph as finally adopted by the Conference reads as follows:

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

- (A) Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;
- (B) Solutions of international economic, social, health, and re-

lated problems and *international cultural and educational cooperation* and

- (C) Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

At the same time, owing to the possibility that an independent international office of education and cultural cooperation might be established, it was decided to omit specific provision for a commission under the Economic and Social Council which should deal with "cultural" or "educational and cultural" affairs.

Serious consideration was also given immediately to the first representation of the four groups relative to relations of the Economic and Social Council with non-governmental organizations, national and international. This was a matter of great importance to educational as well as to organizations in the fields of agriculture, business, and labor.

The paragraph on this subject as finally adopted by the Conference reads as follows:

The Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence. Such arrangements may be made with international organizations and, where appropriate, with national organizations after consultation with the member of the United Nations concerned.

Obviously the educational interests of the country are much indebted to the consultants representing the agricultural, business, and labor organizations at San Francisco for their support of the request for specific inclusion of "education" in the international charter. These consultants, who signed the formal statement endorsing the above recommendations, represented the following organizations: American Farm Bureau Federation, American Federation of Labor, American Section of the International Chamber of Commerce, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Council on Foreign Relations, General Federation of Women's Clubs, National Association of Manufacturers, Na-

tional Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Farmers Union, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., National Foreign Trade Council, National Grange. Of course, the consultants of the four educational groups also signed the formal statement.

Elevation of the Economic and Social Council. In the course of the Conference the Dumbarton Oaks proposals relating to the functions of the Economic and Social Council were amended in a number of other important ways. In this process it soon became clear that this agency may well become one of the most important means of promoting friendly relations and international peace during what is hoped will be the long years of peace which lie ahead. With this in mind the conference early agreed to take the Council out from under the direct supervision of the Assembly and to elevate it to a principal body, equal in status to the Security Council, the World Court, and the Assembly itself. Obviously this is one of the most important actions taken by the Conference.

Territorial Trusteeships and Education. Once the log jam on "education" was removed, the word immediately attained a considerable measure of popularity. In the basic objectives of the territorial trusteeship system the conference finally included among the basic objectives of the international trusteeship system the following statement:

To promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories and their progressive development toward self-government or independence, as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples, etc.

The means by which the objective of "educational advancement" was to be carried out were provided for in the following two specific provisions of the charter:

To insure the political, social and educational advancement of the peoples concerned, their just treatment and their protection against abuses;

To transmit regularly to the secretary-general for information purposes, subject to such limitation as security and constitutional consideration may require, statistical and other information of a

technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational development in the territories for which they are respectively responsible, etc.

In these and other commitments the powers concerned have accepted solemn obligations of the first magnitude. The "educational advancement" of the peoples in the trust territories should be regarded as one of the most important tests of the whole trusteeship system.

An International Office of Educational and Cultural Affairs. While the San Francisco Conference was in session, the House of Representatives on May 22 and the Senate on May 24 passed the Mundt and the Fulbright and Taft Resolutions, respectively, recognizing that "the future peace and security of the American and all other peoples rest upon the achievement of mutual understanding among the peoples of the world" and urging the participation of the United States Government in the organization of a permanent international organization for educational and cultural affairs. This is a very happy chapter in the drive to give education its proper place and responsibility in maintaining world peace. If established, such an independent organization would cooperate with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. It is believed that an international conference to consider the setting up of such an organization will be called shortly after the close of the San Francisco Conference, perhaps in the early autumn.

The Consultants and the United States Delegation. The invitation by the State Department to 42 organizations to send consultants to the San Francisco Conference was frankly an experiment in democratic procedure and public relations. The experiment succeeded beyond anyone's expectations. The members of the United States Delegation discussed their problems freely with the consultants, who in turn offered candid criticisms, which in a number of instances proved helpful. The consultants, on the other hand, came away from the conference with a deeper understanding of the many intricate and baffling problems confronting the conference, and with a deep sense of obligation to do their part in reporting their impressions to their respective constituencies, and

above all to support solidly and enthusiastically the international charter of the United Nations.

Obligation to Study the Charter of the United Nations. This bulletin has been concerned primarily with the story of how the provisions with respect to "education" were inserted in the international charter at San Francisco. Educators will rejoice at this victory because they know how dependent the success of international political machinery is upon international mutual understanding and good will.

In this process of education there is an immediate task before us. The proposed international charter holds within its carefully chosen provisions the future peace of the world. Hence it is a document of the greatest possible moment to every man, woman, and child in this and every other country in the world. It cannot possibly fulfill our ardent hopes, however, unless it becomes deeply ingrained common knowledge. Our educational system is society's most extensive means of disseminating knowledge and developing individual ideals. Therefore the charter of the United Nations should become at once a subject of extended and continuing study in every school and college throughout our broad land.

In July, 1945 the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, which has been meeting in London for several years, prepared a draft constitution for a proposed Educational and Cultural Organization of the United Nations. Dr. Grayson N. Kefauver, a member of the Association, has been a representative of the United States at this conference since April, 1944. Dr. Kefauver is Dean of the School of Education of Stanford University. The British Government has issued invitations to the United States and other countries to an international conference to be held in London early in November to consider the establishment of the proposed Educational and Cultural Organization of the United Nations. At this conference revisions in the draft constitution recommended by the representatives of the several participating countries will be considered. The Department of State has prepared a pamphlet explanatory of this development including the draft constitution. The text of this pamphlet follows.

Proposed Educational and Cultural Organization of the United Nations

The Problem: Background and Analysis

Representatives of the United Nations will meet in London in November to work out the final constitution of a proposed Educational and Cultural Organization of the United Nations. A preliminary constitution, formulated during the last 18 months, will serve as the working document at the London meeting much as the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals served as the basis for the United Nations Charter which was evolved at San Francisco last spring. A delegation named by the President of the United States will represent this country at the London meeting. Congressional approval of the final constitution is necessary for the United States to become a member of the proposed Educational and Cultural Organization.

The aim of the United Nations is to promote peace, understanding, and cooperation among the peoples of the world. In furtherance of this objective a number of organizations associated with the United Nations are being set up and others are being planned. Among these is the proposed Educational and Cultural Organization to be affiliated with the United Nations through the Economic and Social Council which deals primarily with developing the social and economic foundations of peace. It would be a responsibility of the proposed Educational and Cultural Organization to help supply the educational and cultural foundation for the effective operation of the United Nations programs.

United Nations Charter. At San Francisco the important place of cultural and educational cooperation was clearly recognized both in discussion and in the United Nations Charter itself.

Two of the stated purposes of the United Nations are "to develop friendly relations among nations," and "to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character." This latter purpose is again reiterated in the statement of principles of the Economic and Social Council. The Charter provides that "the various specialized agencies established by inter-governmental

agreement and having wide international responsibilities, as defined in their basic instruments, in economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields, shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations. . . ." For non-self-governing territories, the Charter accepts "as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end" insures "with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses." The international trusteeship system set up in the Charter has as one of its basic objectives "to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories."

Provision has been made for the specialized agencies, like the proposed Educational and Cultural Organization, to be brought into relationship with the United Nations. The Economic and Social Council may coordinate the activities of the specialized agencies through consultation with and recommendations to such agencies and through recommendations to the General Assembly and to the members of the United Nations.

Both in the discussions at San Francisco and in the Charter itself the basic importance of cultural and educational cooperation has been recognized.

In San Francisco various delegates pointed out the need for an early international conference to establish an organization for cultural cooperation, and their statements received strong support from the delegates.

The Value of Organization. The final factor in determining whether or not there shall be peace on earth is the human will and the capacity of man to develop institutions and practices that will reinforce and give expression to that will. The mind of man is and can continue to be the greatest peace force in the world.

"Mere documents, language, and phrases cannot themselves prevent war and preserve peace," said Senator Tom Connally of Texas. "They must rest upon the will and purpose and the desires of the peoples and nations of the world. Organization, however, promotes these objectives."

The fact demonstrated by this war, that international relations based on power politics offer no security to any nation, leaves mankind confronted with the choice of accepting a new basis for international cooperation or of facing the danger of annihilation. No longer can a nation be assured of security by isolating itself or drawing apart from the rest of the world. As President Roosevelt wrote the night before his death:

Today science has brought all the different quarters of the globe so close together that it is impossible to isolate them one from another. Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to profit, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together, to work together in the same world, at peace.

The Educational and Cultural Organization. Only with some degree of understanding and some meeting of men's minds can the peoples of the earth work together for their mutual benefit.

The Educational and Cultural Organization is designed to lay the foundations of agreement in men's minds and to use the world's wealth and diversity of knowledge for lasting peace, greater cooperation, and higher living-standards among the peoples of the world. To that end it is intended to be an international clearing-house for the exchange of ideas and information not merely between governments but especially between peoples everywhere. All channels of communication and contact known to modern man would be used in letting people of all groups and all occupations of one nation know about the technical skills, ways of doing things, creative achievements, the thoughts, ideas, beliefs, likes, and character of people in other lands.

There is a tremendous body of knowledge in the world. The war has added considerably to it. The search for new knowledge continues. The proposal now is to set up the machinery for making that knowledge available to the peoples of the world so that they can use it to their mutual benefit in promoting prosperity, good will, and peace. Politics, business, finance, labor have developed agencies for international cooperation. But heretofore there has been no adequate international means for working on the mutual exchange of ideas, for identifying and working on the

solution of common educational and cultural problems on an international scale.

President Truman recently stated:

We must set up an effective agency for constant and thorough interchange of thought and ideas. For there lies the road to a better and more tolerant understanding among nations and among peoples.

Conference of Allied Ministers of Education. During the German invasion of Europe a number of the Allied governments, exiled from their countries, established themselves in London. One of the most important and difficult problems they faced was the educational and cultural rehabilitation of the enemy-occupied countries. To discuss the many educational problems of the immediate postwar period, the Allied Ministers of Education met in informal meetings from which the Conference of Allied Ministers developed, with a secretariat supplied by the British Council (which is responsible for Great Britain's cultural-relations program with other countries).

Meeting for the first time in October, 1942 the Conference was composed of the Ministers of Education or other officials of Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Yugoslavia, the President of the Board of Education of Great Britain, and the Commissioner of Education of the French National Committee. The members of the Conference began assembling information about the damage done to educational institutions in occupied Europe and undertook a study of possible requirements for the restoration of the educational systems in their respective countries. Since it soon became clear that all the United Nations were likely to be interested in the subjects discussed, invitations to participate in the Conference were sent to China, the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the four British Dominions, and India, all of whom sent observers.

Draft Constitution. The Conference of Allied Ministers of Education had been from the beginning interested in a wider organization. At meetings held in London in April, 1944 attended by a delegation from the United States, the Conference gave strong

support to the plan for a United Nations agency for educational and cultural reconstruction which was formulated during the London meetings presided over by Representative, now Senator, Fulbright. A tentative draft constitution, presented by the delegates from the United States, was modified and approved by the Conference and later transmitted by the British Government, at the request of the Conference, to the United Nations for study and comment.

After the visit of the American Delegation to London in April, 1944 the position of the United States became that of a cooperating nation, participating actively in the work of the Conference of the Allied Ministers of Education. The United States has since had a continuing representative in London on the work of the Conference.

In the United States, following the receipt from the London conference of the tentative draft constitution approved in the meetings in April, 1944, careful study was made of the document by officials of the Department of State. They sought advice, also, from leaders in the educational and cultural spheres of American life.

Realizing that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were being considered by the United Nations and a permanent United Nations organization would soon be made a reality, the Department of State prepared a revised draft of the constitution calling for a permanent organization. This was sent to the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, which also received comments from others of the United Nations. The proposed Organization would work with the long-range and continuing problems of cultural and educational interchange. It would not deal with reeducation in Axis countries or with the material questions of immediate postwar cultural and educational rehabilitation.

Activities. The draft constitution proposes that the Educational and Cultural Organization be authorized to direct its activities along six major lines. It could: (1) "Facilitate consultation" among educational and cultural leaders through the regular activities of the Organization and by special meetings and conferences; (2) "Assist the free flow of ideas and information among the peoples of the world" through the classroom and other educational and

cultural institutions, and through the avenues of communication—radio, press, publications, etc.; (3) "Foster the growth . . . of educational and cultural programmes" which support peace and security; (4) "Develop and make available" to nations educational and cultural plans for their consideration and use as they see fit; (5) "Conduct and encourage research and studies" on educational and cultural problems relating to peace and the advancement of human welfare; and (6) "Assist countries that need and request help in developing their educational and cultural activities."

Governmental Programs of Cultural Relations. Before the establishment of the United Nations the work of governments in educational and cultural interchange had been developing in two directions: the first, bilateral interchange between countries, and the second, multilateral cooperation, typified in the work of the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations.

Programs of cultural relations conducted bilaterally with other countries have played an increasingly important rôle in the national affairs of the great and small countries of the world. So effective were the friendly relations built through cultural interchange that nations have increasingly recognized this work as an essential element in their foreign-policy operations. Cultural and educational interchange has involved such activities as circulation of books and periodicals of every kind, exchange of scientific information, exchange of experts and students, assembling of art exhibitions, aid to scientific expeditions, and exchange of knowledge among teachers, students, and experts in many different fields.

Before World War I several European countries, notably France, had fairly extensive programs of cultural relations abroad. Between the two World Wars most of the European governments developed and expanded their cultural-relations activities. Great Britain, for example, set up the British Council in 1934 as a quasi-official organization under the supervision of the Foreign Office to carry out an active program of cultural relations abroad.

During the thirties the German and Italian governments used their cultural-relations programs as instruments of political pressure. Their misuse of cultural relations sprang from a philosophy that was contrary to international cooperation and friendly under-

standing among peoples. To help uproot the danger latent in the misuse of educational and cultural facilities is an aim of the proposed Educational and Cultural Organization. The exchange of knowledge through the Organization would be a means of assisting in solving many social, economic, educational, cultural, and political problems which cause international conflict.

The Department of State believes that cultural-relations activities should be of mutual benefit to all countries participating in them, should extend to all groups of the populations, should promote human welfare, and preserve intellectual and cultural freedom.

United States Cultural-Relations Program. The United States did not initiate an official program of cultural relations until 1938. From 1938 to 1941 this Government's program was concentrated in the Western Hemisphere and designed to carry out the good-neighbor policy. It included such activities as travel and study grants, the exchange of professors and books, assistance to United States cultural centers such as libraries, institutes, and schools, and the distribution of informational motion pictures. In November, 1941 the Secretary of State informed the President that the initiation of a program in China could substantially aid Chinese scientific and cultural work during the war years. The China program revolved around four principal activities: the sending of American technical experts requested by the Chinese Government, the exchange of professors, the awarding of study grants to Chinese students in the United States, and the sending in microfilm of technical and scholarly journals requested by Chinese universities.

In 1943 the Department of State initiated a program in the Near East and Africa on funds allocated by the President from his Emergency Fund. Cultural relations with European countries have been delayed because of war conditions.

Today the cultural relations of the United States form an integral part of the nation's foreign-policy program; the work includes interchanges in all fields of the arts, sciences, technology, letters, and education.

There are now 48 cultural-relations officers stationed in 30 different countries carrying on extensive and diverse activities of mutual benefit. The cultural-relations officer provides informa-

tion on almost all phases of life in the United States, makes speeches, writes articles, advises educators who desire American teachers or who wish to work out professional or student exchanges, aids in setting up courses in the English language, and assists noteworthy men and women to come to the United States.

This Government also works with 28 Cultural Institutes in Latin America and China. The institutes are in the main financed locally, but receive small grants from the United States Government. English is taught at most of the institutes; lectures, motion pictures, and art exhibitions are scheduled regularly; and extensive libraries are being built up.

Since the cultural-relations program began, advisory committees made up of outstanding cultural leaders in the United States, educators, scientists, librarians, men and women of varied professional and business experience have worked closely with the Government and contributed greatly to the success of the program.

*The League of Nations: Institute of Intellectual Cooperation.*¹ After the first World War, when the Council and the Assembly of the League of Nations began to function, they were faced, like the individual governments, with political and material tasks of such a pressing nature that cultural and educational problems were overshadowed. Henri Bonnet, now French Ambassador to the United States, formerly a member of the League Secretariat, wrote:

The concern for intellectual life, which had been so great in all civilized countries in the days before 1914 was undoubtedly overshadowed after the war by other considerations. It may even be said that the League itself or its member governments failed to grasp the profound need of a real peace strongly guaranteed and founded on comprehension and cooperation, which dominated very large sections of the populations throughout the world and especially in Europe, despite the fact that that continent was still torn by rivalries and distrust.

¹ Another intergovernmental agency in this field is the International Bureau of Education. Originally launched as a private undertaking in 1925, it was reorganized as an intergovernmental institution in 1929. By 1938 it had 17 government members. It aimed at being a technical and scientific organization at the service of Ministers of Public Instruction and educators. Although headquarters were in Geneva, the Bureau was not affiliated with the League of Nations.

The League Covenant, he continued,

contained some precise prescriptions about health, social welfare, freedom of transit, and equitable conditions of trade, but there was nothing at all about intellectual work. Thus the League had no legal basis on which to deal with these questions when called to organize its activities.

In September, 1921 the Council of the League decided to create the International Committee of Intellectual Cooperation to carry out a resolution of the previous December calling for the Council of the League to participate in this endeavor. In 1926 the Assembly of the League in a special resolution recognized the existence of a technical Organization of Intellectual Cooperation, to have the same status as the other organs of the League.

The League accepted the French Government's offer to create the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation. This Institute, which began functioning in Paris in 1926, together with a section of the League Secretariat in Geneva, constituted the executive body of the Intellectual Organization.

During the period between 1920 and 1939 there was an acceleration of regional and international cultural, scientific, and educational exchange through public and private agencies. Many international private organizations of specialists in fields of international activity were organized, and the Intellectual Cooperation Organization cooperated with them.

Work of the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation. In the beginning, emphasis was placed on work of a rather technical nature such as attempts to facilitate inter-university relations; to create a regular interchange of views and methods between libraries and institutes of art and archaeology; to establish a uniform terminology in the sciences; to start instruction in the schools of the aims of the League of Nations and of the methods of international collaboration. It stimulated the creation in many countries of national committees of intellectual cooperation with representatives of the various branches of knowledge. Moreover, the Intellectual Cooperation Organization directly and through cooperating groups initiated international conferences and research studies, worked on

many technical questions, and exchanged information in a variety of intellectual and scientific fields.

Two bodies were created by the Intellectual Cooperation Organization to insure permanent contact and liaison with already existing international private organizations. One was the joint committee on the major educational associations, the other the joint committee of the international organizations of students. There was also a secretariat for the exact and natural sciences, set up by agreement with the International Council of Scientific Unions.

When World War II broke out, the work of the Organization was, of course, interrupted.

While its work was not sufficiently extended nor developed to provide a broad and popular base of cooperation between peoples of various nations, the efforts of the Intellectual Cooperation Organization made a very important contribution to cultural interchange and have provided valuable experience and guidance in shaping the plans for the United Nations Educational and Cultural Organization.

Congressional Resolutions. Today peoples throughout the world are aware of the importance of developing and extending cultural and educational cooperation on an international basis.

Widespread support in the United States for such an international organization has crystallized in companion resolutions introduced into the House of Representatives by Congressman Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota, and in the Senate by Senator J. William Fulbright, of Arkansas, and Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio. These resolutions were passed unanimously by both Houses. House Resolution 215, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, reads:

WHEREAS the achievement of a peaceful and orderly life among the peoples of the world has become critical as a result of the war; and

WHEREAS the future peace and security of the American and of all other peoples rest upon the achievement of mutual understanding among the peoples of the world, the universal application of the principles of the Golden Rule, the application of reason and knowledge to the solution of domestic as well as international problems, and effective education at all levels; and

WHEREAS the Axis countries have pursued a deliberate policy of destroying the technical, professional, and teaching personnel of the countries they have conquered, and have encouraged hatred and misunderstanding between nations, peoples, and cultural groups; and

WHEREAS these circumstances present a persisting problem which, if not solved, will result in the perpetuation of conditions of life most likely to cause peoples to resort to violence and war; and

WHEREAS it is essential to collaborate with other nations to promote educational advancement and at the same time to direct education toward the achievement of mutual understanding among the nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States urges the participation by the Government of the United States in the creation of an international educational and cultural organization by the nations of the world for the purpose of advising together and to consider problems of international educational and cultural relations throughout the world and more particularly to organize a permanent international agency to promote educational and cultural relations, the exchange of students, scholars, and other educational and cultural leaders and materials, and the encouragement within each country of friendly relations among nations, peoples, and cultural groups: *Provided, however*, That such agency shall not interfere with educational systems or programs within the several nations, or their administration.

At hearings on the Mundt resolution before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, May, 1945, every witness favored the resolution, and no dissenting testimony was expressed.

The Next Step. So, out of a long experience in various types of cultural and educational interchange, representatives of the United Nations will meet in London in November, 1945 to consider the draft constitution of the proposed Educational and Cultural Organization of the United Nations.

In the meantime, the American people have an opportunity to consider this draft constitution and to indicate their views on the various topics it considers.

It is proposed that the Organization will come into effect, after discussions and final drafting at the London conference, when 20 of the governments of the United Nations shall have filed official notice of their adherence to the Organization.

Draft Constitution

THE HIGH CONTRACTING PARTIES

Determined that all possible steps shall be taken to further the attainment of international security and peace and to advance the welfare of the peoples of the world;

Recognising that co-operation in education and the furtherance of cultural interchange in the arts, the humanities and the sciences will promote the freedom, the dignity and the well-being of all and therefore assist in the attainment of understanding, confidence, security and peace among the peoples of the world;

Dedicated to the proposition that the free and unrestricted education of the peoples of the world, and the free and unrestricted exchange among them of ideas and knowledge are essential to the advancement of human welfare and to the preservation of security and peace;

Hereby establish the Educational and Cultural Organisation of the United Nations and agree to support its broad purposes and functions as expressed in this constitution through their participation in the activities of this international agency and through their respective national educational and cultural programmes.

ARTICLE I

Purposes

The purposes of the Educational and Cultural Organisation of the United Nations shall be:

(1) To develop and maintain mutual understanding and appreciation of the life and culture, the arts, the humanities and the sciences of the peoples of the world, as a basis for effective international organisation and world peace.

(2) To co-operate in extending and in making available to all peoples for the service of common human needs the world's full body of knowledge and culture, and in assuring its contribution to the economic stability, political security, and general well-being of the peoples of the world.

ARTICLE II

Principal Functions

To achieve these purposes the Organisation shall:

- (1) Facilitate consultation among leaders in the educational and cultural life of all peace-loving countries.
- (2) Assist the free flow of ideas and information among the peoples of the world through schools, universities and other educational and research institutions, libraries, publications and the press, the radio and the motion picture, international conferences and the exchange of students, teachers and all other representatives of educational and cultural life, with special attention to the exchange of information on major educational and cultural developments, including advances in scientific knowledge.
- (3) Foster the growth, within each country and in its relations with other countries, of educational and cultural programmes which give support to international peace and security.
- (4) Develop and make available educational and cultural plans and materials for such consideration and use as each country may deem appropriate.
- (5) Conduct and encourage research and studies on educational and cultural problems related to the maintenance of peace and the advancement of human welfare.
- (6) Assist countries that need and request help in developing their educational and cultural activities.

ARTICLE III

Membership

1. Members of the United Nations shall automatically be granted the right of membership. Other nations may be admitted by the Conference, acting by a two-thirds vote, upon recommendation of the Executive Board.
2. Any member may withdraw from the Organisation after two years' notice of intention to do so, provided that its financial obligations shall have been fulfilled at the time of withdrawal.
3. Each member undertakes, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the organisation

promptly its share of the expenses. The right of a member to vote in the Conference and the eligibility of its nationals to be elected to the Executive Board shall be automatically suspended for any member that fails for two successive years to meet its financial obligations to this Organisation, with the proviso that the Conference may in exceptional circumstances waive such suspension.

4. Members of the Organisation which are suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership in the United Nations shall automatically be suspended from the rights and privileges of this Organisation.

ARTICLE IV

Organs

1. The Organisation shall include a Conference, an Executive Board, and a Secretariat.

ARTICLE V

The Conference

A. COMPOSITION.

Alternative a.

The Conference shall consist of the representatives of the members of the Organisation. The Government of each member state shall appoint not more than five representatives, who shall be selected in agreement with the National Co-operating Body or Bodies (or National Commission).

Alternative b.

The Conference shall consist of the representatives of the members of the Organisation. The Government of each member state shall designate not more than five delegates. Three out of a five-member delegation shall be selected in agreement with the National Co-operating Body or Bodies (or National Commission). When a state does not appoint the full delegation of five, one delegate only shall be appointed independently by the Government, except that, when there is only one delegate that delegate shall be

selected in agreement with the National Co-operating Body or Bodies (or National Commission).

Alternative c.

The Conference shall consist of the representatives of the members of the Organisation. The Government of each member state shall appoint not more than five delegates who shall be selected after consultation with the National Co-operating Body or Bodies (or National Commission).

Alternative d.

The Conference shall consist of the representatives of the members of the Organisation. The Government of each member state shall appoint not more than five delegates who shall be selected after consultation with educational and cultural bodies.

Alternative e.

The Conference consists of the representatives of the members of the Organisation. The Government of each member state shall appoint not more than five delegates who will be selected, if convenient to the government concerned, after consultation with educational and cultural bodies.¹

B. FUNCTIONS AND POWERS.

1. The Conference shall determine the general policies and the programme of the Organisation.

2. The Conference is empowered to make recommendations to the members. The Conference may by a two-thirds majority adopt for submission to the members with a view to their acceptance by the appropriate constitutional procedure agreements on educational and cultural programmes, designed to accomplish the purposes of the Organisation.

3. The Conference shall advise the United Nations on the Educational and Cultural aspects of matters of concern to the latter in accordance with terms and procedure agreed upon between the appropriate authorities of the two organisations.

¹ The adoption of this alternative would involve the modification of Article VIII in the sense of making this Article entirely optional.

4. The Conference shall receive and consider reports submitted periodically by the members on educational and cultural developments within their respective territories and on the effect given to the recommendations of the Organisation.

5. The Conference shall elect the members of the Executive Board. It shall admit new members to the Organisation and elect the Director-General on the recommendation of the Executive Board.

6. The Conference shall approve the budget of the Organisation and the allocation of financial responsibility to the members.

7. Gifts and bequests may be accepted by the Conference and utilised under its direction provided the conditions of the gift or bequest are consistent with the purposes and policies of the organisation.

C. VOTING.

Each Member State shall have one vote in the Conference. Decisions shall be made by a simple majority of those present and voting, except where otherwise specified in this instrument.

D. PROCEDURE.

1. The Conference shall meet annually in regular session; it may meet in extraordinary session on the call of the Executive Board. The sessions shall be held from time to time within the territories of different members.

2. The Conference shall set up such committees and other subordinate bodies as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

3. The Conference shall elect its own officers and adopt its own rules of procedure.

ARTICLE VI

The Executive Board

A. COMPOSITION.

The Executive Board shall consist of fifteen persons elected by the Conference from among the delegates. In electing the members of the Executive Board, the Conference shall have regard to

the desirability of including persons with varied experience in education, in the arts, the humanities and the sciences, bearing in mind geographical distribution. Not more than one delegate from any member state shall serve on the Board at any one time. The members of the Board shall serve for a term of three years and shall not be immediately eligible for re-election. At the first election, five persons shall be elected for a three-year term, five for two years, and five for one year. Thereafter, five persons shall be elected each year. Members elected to the Executive Board for a partial term shall be eligible for re-election.

B. FUNCTIONS AND POWERS.

1. The Executive Board shall be responsible within the competence of the Organisation for giving effect to the programme for the Organisation adopted by the Conference.

2. The Executive Board shall supervise the administration of the Organisation and prepare the agenda for the meetings of the Conference.

3. The Executive Board shall recommend to the Conference the admission of new members to the Organisation.

4. It shall be empowered to make appointments to fill vacancies in its membership, which appointments shall terminate at the next meeting of the Conference, when an election shall be held for the unexpired term.

5. The members of the Executive Board shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the Conference on behalf of the whole Conference and not as representatives of their respective governments.

C. PROCEDURE.

The Executive Board shall elect its own officers and subject to any decisions of the Conference determine its own rules of procedure.

ARTICLE VII

The Secretariat

1. The Secretariat shall consist of a Director-General and such staff as may be required.

2. The Director-General shall be nominated by the Executive Board and elected by the Conference under such conditions of tenure and compensation as the Conference may approve. He shall be the chief administrative officer of the Organisation, immediately responsible to the Executive Board, and the staff shall be responsible to him. He, or a deputy designated by him, shall participate, without the right to vote, in all meetings of the Conference, the Board, and all committees of the Organisation. He shall formulate proposals for appropriate action by the Conference and the Board.

3. The Director-General shall appoint the staff of the Secretariat under regulations adopted by the Executive Board which shall provide for the approval by the Board of appointments in the higher administrative grades. Subject to the requirements of efficiency and technical competence, the staff shall be recruited on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

4. In the performance of their duties, the Director-General and the staff shall be responsible only to the Organisation. Their responsibilities shall be exclusively international in character, and they shall not seek or receive instructions in regard to the discharge thereof from any authority external to the Organisation. The members undertake to respect fully the international character of the responsibilities of the Secretariat and not to seek to influence any of their nationals in the discharge of such responsibilities.

5. The Conference shall make provision for the determination by an administrative tribunal of disputes relating to the conditions and terms of appointment of members of the staff.

ARTICLE VIII

Alternative titles:—

- (1) National Commissions.
- (2) National Co-operating Bodies.

A. COMPOSITION.

Alternative a.

Each member of the Organisation shall establish a National Commission on educational and cultural co-operation, broadly rep-

representative of the Government and the principal groups devoted to and interested in educational and cultural matters. Delegates to the Conference shall during their period of service be included in the National Commission. Each member state shall be free to adapt the size and scope of the National Commission to its own special conditions.

Alternative b.

Within each member state, the Government shall appoint or recognise a National Co-operating Body or Bodies, representatives of its principal educational and cultural groups, to be associated with the Government in the activities of the Organisation.

Alternative c.

Each member state shall make such arrangements as suit its particular conditions, either by the formation of a National Commission or otherwise, for the purpose of associating bodies of educational and cultural opinion with the work of the Organisation.

B. FUNCTIONS AND POWERS.

1. National Co-operating Bodies (or National Commissions) shall act in an advisory capacity to the National Delegation to the Conference and to the Government in matters relating to the Organisation.

Alternative a.

2. The National Delegation to the Conference shall be appointed by the Government in agreement with the National Co-operating Body or Bodies (or National Commission).

Alternative b.

Certain members of the National Delegation to the Conference shall be appointed by the Government in agreement with the National Co-operating Body or Bodies (or National Commission).

Alternative c.

The National Delegation to the Conference shall be appointed by the Government after consultation with the National Co-operating Body or Bodies (or National Commission).

Alternative d.

The National Delegation to the Conference shall be appointed after consultation with bodies of educational and cultural opinion.

3. The National Co-operating Bodies (or National Commissions) shall consider recommendations and reports made by the Educational and Cultural Organisation of the United Nations and take such steps as are suitable and desirable to further the general objectives of the Organisation.

ARTICLE IX

Reports by Members

1. Each member shall report periodically to the Organisation, in a manner to be determined by the Conference, on activities and developments related to the functions of the Organisation and on the action taken on the recommendations by the Conference.

2. Each member shall upon publication communicate to the Organisation laws, regulations, official reports and statistics concerning its educational and cultural institutions and organisations.

ARTICLE X

Juridical Status of the Organisation and its Personnel

1. The Organisation shall possess international personality and legal capacity. The members of the Organisation shall accord to the Organisation the privileges, immunities, exemptions and facilities which they accord to each other including in particular (a) immunity from every form of legal process; (b) exemption from taxation and customs duties; and (c) inviolability of premises occupied by, and of the archives and communications of, the Organisation.

2. The members of the Organisation shall accord diplomatic privileges and immunities to persons appointed by other members as their representatives in or to the Organisation, and to the higher officials of the Organisation not being their own nationals. They

shall accord to all officials and employees of the Organisation (a) immunity from suit and legal process relating to acts performed by them in their official capacity; (b) exemption from taxation of their official salaries and emoluments; and, in general (c) such privileges, exemptions and facilities as they accord under similar circumstances to officials and employees of foreign governments.

ARTICLE XI

Amendments

1. Proposals for amendments to this instrument shall require the approval of the Conference by a two-thirds majority, and amendments shall take effect on ratification by two-thirds of the member states. The draft texts of proposed amendments shall be communicated by the Director-General to the members at least six months in advance of their consideration by the Conference.

2. The Conference shall have power to adopt by a two-thirds majority rules prescribing the times within which proposed amendments must be accepted in order to become effective and other rules of procedure to carry out the provisions of this Article.

ARTICLE XII

Interpretation

1. The English and French texts of the Constitution shall be regarded as authoritative.

2. Any question or dispute concerning the interpretation of this instrument shall be referred for determination to the international court of justice or to an arbitral tribunal as the Conference may determine.

ARTICLE XIII

Relations with the United Nations

1. The Organisation shall be brought in relationship with the United Nations, this relationship to be defined by an agreement approved by the appropriate organs of both bodies.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article XI, such agree-

ment may, if approved by the Conference by a two-thirds majority, involve modification of the provisions of this Constitution, provided that no such agreement shall modify the purposes and limitations of the Organisation.

ARTICLE XIV

Relations with Other Specialised International Organisations

1. The Organisation may co-operate with other specialised international organisations, both public and private, whose interests and activities are related to and in harmony with its purposes.

2. The Executive Board, with the approval of the Conference, may enter into agreements with the competent authorities of such organisations defining the distribution of responsibilities and methods of co-operating, and maintain such joint committees with them as may be necessary to assure effective co-operation.

3. Whenever the Conference of this Organisation and the competent authorities of any other organisation whose purposes are similar deem it desirable to effect transfer of the resources and functions of the latter to this Organisation, the Executive Board, subject to the approval of the Conference, may enter into mutually acceptable arrangements for this purpose.

ARTICLE XV

Establishment of the Organisation

This instrument shall come into force when twenty of the Governments of the United Nations shall have filed with the Interim Educational and Cultural Commission of the United Nations (to be set up in accordance with the Transitory Provisions) official notice of their acceptance of it and adherence to the Organisation. Thereupon the Chairman of the Interim Commission shall cause to be convened the first meeting of the Conference of the Organisation, which shall proceed with the election of the Executive Board and the Director-General and shall make whatever other arrangements which may be necessary to put the Organisation into operation.

Transitory Provisions

1. Pending the approval of the Constitution by twenty nations and the calling of the first meeting of the Conference, the persons designated in Annex 1 of this Constitution shall serve as members of the Interim Educational and Cultural Commission of the United Nations. This commission shall call the first meeting of the Conference and prepare the Agenda and preliminary analyses required for effective action by the Conference.

This Interim Commission shall be assisted by an international Secretariat and financed by the participating Governments in a manner to be determined at the Constituent Conference.

2. The following exceptional arrangements shall apply in respect of the financial year in which this Constitution comes into force: the budget shall be the provisional budget set forth in Annex 2 of this Constitution, and the amount to be contributed by member states shall be in the proportion set forth in Annex 3 of this Constitution.

NOTE—Annexes 1, 2, and 3 will be drawn up at the Constituent Conference.

THE PRESIDENT'S VIEWS

THE WHITE HOUSE

Washington, September 6, 1945

At the San Francisco Conference the representatives of fifty-one nations accepted the belief that lasting peace cannot be assured alone by the cooperation of armed forces, of foreign offices, and of international financiers and traders. They recognized that additional efforts must somehow be made to increase the understanding between nations and between peoples, whose mass opinions are now so important to peace.

To this end the United Nations Charter signed at San Francisco pledged all member nations to promote international cultural and educational cooperation, and contemplated an international agency for this work.

The British Government has now invited the United Nations to send delegates to a United Nations Conference at London in November to discuss a new international organization for education and cultural affairs, an organization which would help bring together leaders of education, science, the professions, and the arts across international boundaries and assure a greater interchange of thoughts and ideas. An agency for this purpose has my full support.

A tentative draft constitution for the new organization has already been published. This constitution will be the basis for discussion at London.

I hope that our citizens will study the plans for this important undertaking toward building a lasting peace.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

For the consideration of the draft constitution of the proposed Educational and Cultural Organization of the United Nations, the American Council on Education called a conference of representatives of its members on September 21 and 22 in Washington, D. C. Prior to this conference the Council sought the views of its members with reference to the draft constitution through a detailed questionnaire. A summary of the replies to this questionnaire was presented to the conference by Dr. A. J. Brumbaugh, Vice-President of the Council. At this conference a consensus was reached with reference to the desirability of several revisions in the draft constitution. These were communicated to the Department of State as indicated in the report of the conference which follows.

Report of the American Council on Education to the Department of State

In submitting this Report of the deliberations of a nationally representative group of American scholars, the American Council on Education would express to the Department of State its appreciation for this opportunity of stating its views and for the cooperation of members of the Department in holding the Conference. The Conference group would also register its conviction that, with

the conquest of atomic energy, there has arisen a wholly new urgency in the furtherance of intellectual cooperation among the nations. If, as scientists believe, there is no military defense against robot warfare in the atomic age, the only safety for mankind lies in the direction of intelligence upon the problems of peace, the development of appreciation for cultural values, and the intellectual and spiritual life of nations. The proposed Educational and Cultural Organization has, therefore, even deeper importance and larger responsibilities and opportunities than could have been anticipated earlier. In submitting this statement the Conference group extends to those entrusted with the creation of the Organization its sincere best wishes for success in a great enterprise already well begun.

The recommendations here presented must be considered within a context of praise for the general intent and nature of the Draft Proposals. The recommendations are here formulated without explanatory argument and comment, and in as specific terms as possible.

Recommendations:

1. The name of the organization should be revised to read: *International Organization for Educational and Cultural Cooperation*.
2. In order to clarify the scope of the Organization, the word *scientific* should be added throughout the document wherever the words, educational and cultural, are used together in modification of a common noun.
3. The present Introduction in the Draft Proposals should be revised in order to be made more challenging and positive. It should express a higher sense of the urgency of its work, should emphasize the ethical ends in view, and should contain reference to the necessary limitations of an International Organization in this field.
4. Article I should be revised to read as follows (terms in italics indicate revisions and additions):

ARTICLE I. Purposes

The purposes of the *United Nations Organization for Educational and Cultural Cooperation with due regard to the maintenance of academic and cultural freedom*, shall be:

1. To develop and maintain mutual understanding and appreciation of the life and culture, the arts, the humanities,

and the sciences of the people of the world, as a basis for effective international organization and world peace.

2. To cooperate in extending *human knowledge, and in providing full access to that knowledge for all people*, and in assuring its contribution to economic stability, political security, and general well-being of the peoples of the world.

3. *To facilitate cooperation on an international basis among students, scholars, and technical and professional groups.*

4. *To promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.*

5. *To gather and disseminate information for such use as each nation may deem appropriate about the purpose, structure, and function of international agencies and associations.*

5. A number of revisions are also recommended for Article II, which should read as follows (passages in italics indicate revisions and additions; bracketed passages indicate deletions):

ARTICLE II. *Principal Functions*

To achieve these purposes the Organization, *without interfering with or limiting the educational, scientific, and cultural activities essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state*, shall:

1. Facilitate consultation *and cooperation* among leaders in the educational, *scientific*, and cultural life of all peace-loving countries.

2. Assist the free flow of ideas and information among the peoples of the world through schools, universities, and other educational and research institutions, *voluntary associations*, libraries, publications and the press, radio and motion pictures, international conferences, and the exchange of *materials and personnel in educational, scientific, and cultural fields*, and *promote intellectual cooperation for the advancement of knowledge in all fields.*

3. Foster the growth (within each country and in its relations with other countries) of educational, *scientific*, and cultural programs which give support to international peace and security, *and which tend to develop friendly relations between nations, peoples, and cultural groups.*

4. Develop and make available educational, *scientific*, and cultural plans and materials for such consideration and use as each country may deem appropriate.

5. Conduct and encourage research and studies on educational, *scientific*, and cultural *matters and activities* related to

the maintenance of peace and the advancement of human welfare.

6. Assist countries that need and request aid in developing their educational, *scientific*, and cultural activities.

7. *Encourage bilateral and multilateral agreement and cooperation among states and nongovernmental associations in educational, scientific, and cultural matters.*

8. *Encourage educational progress in non-self-governing areas.*

6. In order to bring the Draft Proposals into harmony with the United Nations Charter concerning withdrawal of member states, it is recommended that Section 2 of Article III be deleted.

7. In Article V, Section A, dealing with the composition of the Conference, it is recommended that the United States favor Alternative (a). If that alternative is not generally acceptable, an appropriate second choice would be Alternative (b). The following new paragraph is favored as third choice:

The Conference shall consist of representatives of the members of the Organization. Each member state shall appoint according to its own constitutional system not more than five delegates to the Conference. These delegates shall be representative not only of governmental bureaus but also of the cultural, scientific, and educational forces, organizations, agencies, and institutions of the member state.

It is the conviction of the recommending group that Alternatives (d) and (e) are not acceptable.

8. It is recommended that Section C, Article V, dealing with voting in the Conference, should be revised to read as follows:

C. *Voting*

Each member state shall have one vote in the Conference on matters of structure, organization, and budget. On all other matters each delegate shall have one vote. Decisions shall be made by a simple majority of those present and voting, *except as otherwise specified in this instrument, provided that a quorum of one-half the members be present.*

9. It is recommended that, in order to provide for greater flexibility, the words *not less than* be inserted before the word *fifteen* in the first line of Article VI, Section A, and then the term *one-third* shall be substituted for *five* subsequently in the section.

10. In the present terms of Article VI the Executive Board members are elected for three years; they must be members of the Conference, and yet Conference members are apparently elected annually. The document should be specific as to whether a per-

son elected to the Executive Board but not re-elected to the Conference should continue to serve on the Board.

11. It is suggested that to Section 3 of Article VII, dealing with the staff of the Secretariat, the following be added:

and may include competent experts on temporary leave of absence from regular posts within their respective nations.

12. In Article VIII various alternatives are suggested concerning the creation of National Commissions. The conferring group recommends that the United States urge Alternative (a) as its first choice. A second choice may be stated as follows:

It is recommended that each state, within the framework of its own constitutional system, establish a National Commission, directly representative of the educational, scientific, cultural, and professional interests of the nation. The Commission shall act in an advisory capacity to the nation's delegation to the Conference and to the government itself in matters relating to fields of its competence.

A third choice is Alternative (c) in the Draft Proposal.

13. Since the "appropriate bodies" are now known, Section 1 of Article XIII should read as follows:

The Organization shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations, this relationship to be defined by an agreement to be approved by the Conference of the Organization and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

14. The conferring group is strongly of the opinion that there should be adequate provision for consultation and cooperation between the Organization and other agencies. There should be more specific provision for consultation with non-governmental agencies. To this end we recommend that the title be broadened and a new section (actually embodying Article 71 of the United Nations Charter) be inserted in Article XIV. The first two Sections of Article XIV should read as follows: Present Sections 2 and 3 should be retained as Sections 3 and 4.

ARTICLE XIV. Relations with Other (Specialized International) Organizations.

1. *The Organization shall make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within the competence of the Organization.*

2. *The Organization may cooperate with other specialized international organizations whose interests and activities are related to and in harmony with its purposes.*

15. It is recommended that the State Department give serious consideration to the possibilities of providing adequate voice in the Organization for the peoples of non-self-governing areas.

16. It was the sense of the meeting that, in the establishment of the Organization, the possibilities of decentralization in administration through strategic regional centers and through widely distributed conferences and consultations should be carefully considered.

GEORGE F. ZOOK

September 24, 1945

In order to be as fully advised as possible of the viewpoints and recommendations of the educational and cultural groups in the United States with reference to the Proposed Educational and Cultural Organization of the United Nations, the Department of State arranged a conference of representatives of the several national educational and cultural organizations. This conference was held in Washington, D. C. on September 24. At this conference and at the conference called by the American Council on Education on September 21 and 22, the American Association of University Professors was represented by the Association's General Secretary.

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD, *General Secretary*

September 26, 1945

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR NORWEGIAN STUDENTS

Norway is confronted with a severe crisis in higher education. Two to three times as many students as can be cared for by existing facilities are this autumn applying for admission to institutions of college and university grade. Some 6300 students applied for admission to the University of Oslo alone. Norwegian authorities are seeking to alleviate the situation in part by placing some of the students in institutions abroad. It is hoped that a fair number of them can be placed in American universities and colleges.

The problem is an interim one and is being handled as a national rather than an institutional one. It is being studied by a government committee. At present the extent of the Government's commitment is that it is prepared to pay ocean travel costs and rail costs in the United States, to and from the institution to which a particular student may be assigned. The Norwegian Government will have closely watched the selection of the students to be sent here. They will be chosen roughly from the upper one-third in academic standing, and some consideration is apt to be given to wartime participation in the resistance movement against the Germans (about 1000 students were sent to camps in Germany while many others fled to Sweden or participated very actively in the underground).

The Norwegian Government has utilized the good offices of the Institute of International Education and of the former United States Office of War Information in making preliminary inquiries regarding placement of the students. Through the facilities of the Institute a circular has been dispatched to several hundred American universities and colleges, placing before them the predicament that Norway and her students face in the year or two ahead. By the end of September, replies had come in from about 115 institutions indicating willingness to provide varying degrees of assistance, ranging from the grant of a year's tuition to grants of tuition, room and board for one or even several years. The problem of

meeting living expenses when tuition grants must be supplemented is being studied; in many cases it probably will be worked out on the basis of the local circumstances peculiar to each case.

Further evidence that the Norwegian student placement program will take on sizable proportions in the next year or two is available in the announcement just made by American Friends of Norway that this organization is assigning its funds to the use of scholarships for Norwegian students who will study in the United States. The funds and the scholarships will be administered by the American Scandinavian Foundation, 116 East 64th Street, New York City.

It is to be hoped that all institutions in this country which can consider any commitment in this field will weigh their prospects seriously and submit their offers in the most generous forms possible. College and university officials may bear in mind that this sort of venture takes on a national aspect for a small country like Norway, and it evokes a national interest and national energies in ways which are apt to have most favorable consequences for the United States.

Queries with reference to this announcement should be addressed to Mr. Hans Olav, Royal Norwegian Information Service, The Norwegian Embassy, Washington 7, D. C.

OSCAR J. FALNES, UNRRA, Washington, D. C.
(on leave, New York University)

REPORT OF THE 1945 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee for the year 1945 herewith submits its report, making nominations for the offices of President, First Vice-President, and Second Vice-President for the two-year term 1946-1947, and nominations for Council membership for the three-year term 1946-1948.

On July 4, 1945 the Committee met in the Washington office of the Association to make its selections. The General Secretary had previously supplied each member of the Committee with the names of more than 250 persons suggested by members of the Association who had made use of the forms distributed for this purpose in January. This list was supplemented by the Committee, with the aid of information available in the office. The work of the Committee was facilitated also by lists of nominees chosen by Committees of earlier years, by a summary of previous Council representation by institutions, and by data concerning candidates from the files of the Association.

Acting under the instructions provided by By-Law 1 of the Association the Committee gave attention to the several "fields of professional interest" and to the different "types of institutions." It also undertook to insure distribution among institutions in each electoral District. The Committee presents the nominees listed below for election by the membership. It should be a source of gratification to all members that the Association continues to be served ably and faithfully in positions of responsibility by men and women of energy and sound judgment.

C. RAYMOND ADAMS (Mathematics), Brown University, *Chairman*

WILLIAM A. BROWNELL (Educational Psychology),
Duke University

BLANCHE DOW (Foreign Languages), Northwest
Missouri State Teachers College

PRESIDENT

EDWARD C. KIRKLAND, History, Bowdoin College

Elected 1930.¹ Council, 1936-38; Committee on Organization and Policy, 1938-41; Chairman, Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, 1942- ; Editorial Committee, 1937- . Member American Civil Liberties Union, 1939. Born 1894. A.B., 1916, Dartmouth College; M.A., 1921, Ph.D., 1924, Harvard University. Instructor, 1920-21, Dartmouth College; Instructor, 1922-24, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Assistant Professor, 1924-30, Associate Professor, 1930-31, Brown University; Professor, 1931- , Bowdoin College.

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

LOUIS PELZER, American History, State University of Iowa

Elected 1921. Chap. Pres., 1943-44. Born 1879. B.A., 1907, Ph.D., 1909, State University of Iowa. Professor, 1909-11, Montana State Normal College; Assistant Professor, 1911-17, Associate Professor, 1917-25, Professor, 1925- , State University of Iowa.

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

ETHEL SABIN-SMITH, Philosophy and Psychology

Elected 1920. Chap. Pres., 1939-42; Council, 1941-43. Born 1887. B.A., 1908, M.A., 1914, University of Wisconsin; Ph.D., 1916, University of Illinois. Assistant, 1916-17, University of Illinois; Associate, 1917-21, Acting Head Department of Philosophy, 1921-22, Bryn Mawr College; Associate Professor and Professor, 1922- , Convenor of School of Graduate Studies, 1929-39, Mills College.

Nominees for the Council, 1946-1948²

DISTRICT I

ALBERT HENRY IMLAH, History, Tufts College

Elected 1929. Member, American Civil Liberties Union, 1940- . Born 1901. B.A., 1922, University of British Columbia; A.M., 1923, Clark University; Ph.D., 1931, Harvard University. Instructor, 1923-26, University of Maine; Assistant, 1926-27, Radcliffe College; Instructor, 1927-29, Assistant Professor, 1929-35, Professor, 1935- , Tufts College; Examiner, 1942-43, Harvard College.

¹ Refers in this and each following statement to the date of election to Association membership.

² One from each district to be elected.

JULIAN I. LINDSAY, English, University of Vermont

Elected 1921. Chap. Secy., 1938-43; Chap. Vice-Pres., 1943-44. Member, American Federation of Teachers, 1945- .

Born 1886. A.B., 1908, Clark University; A.M., 1910, Harvard University. Instructor, 1910-16, Assistant Professor, 1918-28, Associate Professor, 1928-45, Professor, 1945- , University of Vermont.

DISTRICT II**JEREMIAH STANTON FINCH**, English Literature and Public Speaking, Princeton University

Elected 1942. Chap. Secy., 1943-45.

Born 1910. A.B., 1931, M.A., 1933, Ph.D., 1936, Cornell University. Instructor and Assistant, 1934-36, Cornell University; Instructor, 1936-40, Assistant Professor, 1940- , Assistant to Dean of the Faculty, 1942- , Princeton University.

LOIS MEREDITH FRENCH, Mental Hygiene, State Teachers College, Newark, New Jersey

Elected 1940.

Born 1897. A.B., 1919, Grinnell College; Certificate in social work, 1922, Bryn Mawr College; Diploma, 1923, New York School of Social Work; Assistant Professor, 1930- , New Jersey State Teachers College (Newark).

DISTRICT III**WILLIAM H. EDWARDS**, Political Science, State Teachers College, Brockport, New York

Elected 1929. Chap. Pres., 1936-39, New Mexico State College.

Born 1901. B.A., 1923, M.A., 1923, Ph.D., 1936, Ohio State University. Staff Assistant, 1923-24, League of Minnesota Municipalities; government research, 1924-25, Brookings Institution; Instructor, 1925-28, University of North Dakota; Associate Professor, 1928-30, Sweet Briar College; Associate Professor, 1931-32, State Teachers College, River Falls, Wisconsin; Associate Professor, 1934-41, New Mexico State College; Professor and Head of Department, 1941- , State Teachers College, Brockport, New York.

PHILIP LAWRENCE HARRIMAN, Psychology, Bucknell University

Elected 1933.

Born 1894. A.B., 1917, A.M., 1921, Colgate University; Ed.M., 1930, Harvard University; Ph.D., 1931, New York University. Head of Department, 1919-23, Staunton Military Academy; Associate Professor, 1923-29, The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina; Professor, 1930- , Bucknell University.

DISTRICT IV

ESTHER CRANE, Education and Child Development, Goucher College

Elected 1929. Chap. Secy., 1944-45; Chap. Pres., 1945-46.

Born 1892. A.B., 1910, M.A., 1914, Smith College; M.A., 1913, Oberlin College; Ph.D., 1917, University of Chicago. Teacher, 1910-12, Kenton High School; Instructor, 1913-14, Wells College; Assistant Professor, 1917-19, Lake Erie College; Professor, 1919-23, Wilson College; Associate, 1923-25, Bryn Mawr College; Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, 1925- , Goucher College.

PERCIVAL W. HUTSON, Education, University of Pittsburgh

Elected 1926.

Born 1891. B.A., 1913, Beloit College; M. A., 1923, Ph.D., 1925, University of Minnesota. Teacher and principal in secondary schools, 1913-17; 1919-21; Research Assistant on junior college project, 1921-22, University of Minnesota; Assistant Professor, 1922-28, Associate Professor, 1928-38, Professor, 1938- , University of Pittsburgh.

DISTRICT V

PAUL E. HUBBELL, Modern European History, Michigan State Normal College

Elected 1929. Member, American Civil Liberties Union, 1935- .

Born 1891. B.A., 1911, University of Richmond; M.A., 1913, Wake Forest College; B.A., M.A., 1920, Oxford University (Rhodes Scholar); Ph.D., 1938, University of Michigan. Professor, 1913-14, Mars Hill College; Head of Department, 1920-21, High School, Savannah, Georgia; Professor, 1921-22, Furman University; Head of Department, 1922-23, Hardin-Baylor Women's College; Professor, 1923- , Michigan State Normal College.

KATHERINE H. PORTER, English, Western Reserve University

Elected 1935. Chap. Secy., 1943-45.

Born 1888. A.B., 1910, Mount Holyoke College; M.A., 1914, University of Chicago; Ph.D., 1930, Cornell University. Instructor, 1910-13, Lake Erie College; Professor, 1914-19, Alfred University; Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, 1919- , Assistant Dean, 1927-33, Class Dean, 1944-45, Western Reserve University.

DISTRICT VI

CLEANTH BROOKS, English Literature, Louisiana State University

Elected 1938. Chap. Vice-Pres., 1940-41.

Born 1906. B.A., 1928, Vanderbilt University; M.A., 1929, Tulane University; B.A., 1931, B.Litt., 1932, Oxford University. Lecturer, 1932-34, Assistant Professor, 1934-36, Associate Professor, 1936-42, Professor, 1942- , Louisiana State University; Visiting Professor, 1945-46, University of Chicago.

JULIAN GILBERT LEACH, Plant Pathology, West Virginia University

Elected 1937. Chap. Vice-Pres., 1941-43; Chap. Pres., 1943-45.

Born 1894. B.S.A., 1917, University of Tennessee; M.S., 1918, Ph.D., 1922, University of Minnesota. Associate Professor, 1919-20, Colorado Agricultural College; Instructor, 1920-22, Assistant Professor, 1922-28, Associate Professor, 1928-36, Professor, 1936-38, University of Minnesota; Professor and Head of Department, 1938- , West Virginia University.

DISTRICT VII

LLOYD V. BALLARD, Sociology, Beloit College

Elected 1943. Chap. Pres., 1943-44.

Born 1887. A.B., 1912, Beloit College; A.M., 1913, Harvard University; Graduate Study, 1917-18, University of Chicago. Professor, 1913- , Head of Department, 1921- , Beloit College.

KENNETH P. WILLIAMS, Mathematics, Indiana University

Elected 1921. Chairman, Committee Q on Required Courses in Education, 1931-36; Committee Q on Preparation and Qualifications of Teachers, 1937- .

Born 1887. A.B., 1908, A.M., 1909, Indiana University; Ph.D., 1913, Princeton University. Instructor, 1909-14, Assistant Professor, 1914-19, Associate Professor, 1919-24, Professor, 1924- , Chairman of Department, 1937-44, Indiana University.

DISTRICT VIII

JOHN G. HEINBERG, Political Science, University of Missouri

Elected 1933. Chap. Pres., 1942-43.

Born 1901. A.B., 1923, A.M., 1924, Washington University, St. Louis; Ph.D., 1927, Brookings Graduate School. Assistant Professor, 1926-30, Associate Professor, 1930-39, Professor, 1939- , University of Missouri.

GEORGE C. WHEELER, Biology, University of North Dakota

Elected 1926. Chap. Pres. 1932-35, 1945-46.

Born 1897. B.A., 1918, Rice Institute; M.S., 1920, D.Sc., 1921, Harvard University. Instructor, 1921-25, Assistant Professor, 1925-26, Syracuse University; Professor, 1926- , University of North Dakota.

DISTRICT IX

JOHN Q. HAYS, English, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas

Elected 1933. Chap. Secy., 1942-43; Chap. Pres., 1944-45.

Born 1906. A.B., 1929, M.A., 1932, University of Missouri; Ph.D., 1942, University of California. Instructor, 1929-35, Assistant Professor, 1935-41, Associate Professor, 1941- , Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas.

RALPH S. UNDERWOOD, Mathematics, Texas Technological College

Elected 1930. Chap. Secy., 1931-32, 1939-40; Chap. Pres., 1940-41.

Born 1891. B.A., 1916, M.A., 1917, University of Minnesota; Ph.D., 1930, University of Chicago. Instructor, 1919-22, Purdue University; Assistant Professor, 1922-27, Alabama Polytechnic Institute; Associate Professor, 1927-30, Professor, 1930- , Texas Technological College.

DISTRICT X

ORLANDO J. HOLLIS, Law, University of Oregon

Elected 1934. Chap. Pres., 1937-38.

Born 1904. B.S., 1926, J.D., 1928, University of Oregon. Lecturer, 1928-31, Professor, 1931- , Acting Dean, various periods, 1936-45, Acting President, January 6, 1944-June 30, 1945, Dean since July 1, 1945, University of Oregon.

GEORGE W. SEARS, Chemistry, University of Nevada

Elected 1922. Chap. Pres., 1932-33.

Born 1878. B.S., 1908, Drury College; M.S., 1911, Ph.D., 1914, University of Illinois. Teacher, 1909-10, High School, Springfield, Missouri; Assistant, 1911-14, Instructor, 1914-17, University of Illinois; Instructor, 1917-18, Associate Professor, 1918-24, Professor, 1924- , Head of Department, 1926- , Acting Dean, College of Arts and Science, 1938, University of Nevada.

ASSOCIATION NEWS

University of Michigan

The annual business meeting of the University of Michigan Chapter was held in the Michigan Union May 28, following a social hour around the luncheon table. After reports and the election of officers, the special order of business was introduced, the consideration of two resolutions, each calling for the establishment of a standing committee.

A few years ago the Chapter formulated propositions on the Evaluation of Faculty Services which were influential in shaping plans within the University for such evaluation. Inasmuch as these plans were not adopted by all divisions, were tentative, and have been suspended for the duration, the resolution calls for the setting up of a standing committee of the Chapter "to be known as the Committee on Personnel, whose province shall be the problem of improvement of teaching, the evaluation of faculty services and recommendations for promotion . . ." and whose duty it shall be to gather information, make studies, and submit proposals for action by the Chapter.

The other resolution is concerned with democratization in the organization of the University. Expressing the belief that a university "should be primarily a democratic organization of scholars" and recognizing wide differences in organization within colleges and departments, the resolution calls for a committee "to be known as the Committee on Problems of Democratization in University Organization . . ." whose duty it shall be to gather information on various branches of University organization together with faculty opinion on the subject and to present its findings and suggestions for action to the chapter. Both resolutions were adopted.

The Chapter was fortunate to have as a guest Professor Frank L. Griffin, First Vice-President of the Association. During the discussion of the resolutions he made a most pertinent contribution, commenting on the problems of evaluation of faculty services as experienced by the Faculty of Reed College.

DWIGHT C. LONG, *Secretary*

New York Metropolitan Chapters

A joint meeting of the chapters of the Association of the metropolitan area of New York City was held at Columbia University on March 22. Professor W. C. Crane of the City College presided.

The speaker was Dr. Hardin Craig, Professor of English at the University of North Carolina, whose subject was "Higher Education in the Postwar World." His address was discussed by Dr. Jacques Barzun, Professor of History at Columbia University, and by Dr. Benjamin Fine, Educational Editor of the *New York Times*.

Some pertinent quotations from Dr. Craig's address follow.

"I have not, however, heard of any concerted effort under way to improve the quality of our work. I am sorry for this, because, as I see it, doing better work is the one valuable and practicable thing we can plan to do after the war. If we are sensible enough to see that no radical changes in kind are called for, can we not also see that changes in quality are necessary and loudly called for?"

"We might restore our command of our own field and elevate again to eminence the respect of the American people for higher education."

Macaulay: "Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely."

"I would like to see faculties reassert and regain their control of higher education."

"We do not submit our students to an impartial Board of Examiners. We are cursed with snap courses."

Woodrow Wilson: "I know better what any sophomore ought to study than that sophomore knows himself."

"We all know in our hearts that we do not so much need to find new things to do and new ways to do them as to do all things well."

"I have already said that I think we should direct our attention toward the establishment and maintenance of better educational standards. I think we should begin to plan this now."

"The only lasting gains that colleges and universities have ever made in their long war against ignorance and barbarism have arisen from the mastery of knowledge and truth."

"Candor compels me to say at the outset that some of the newer disciplines in colleges and universities are sometimes serious offenders against standards."

"Full discussion and considered decision by many minds instead of one mind or a few minds."

Dr. Barzun agreed in the main with Dr. Craig but deplored the "waste of time" incident to the democratic functioning of a college faculty.

Dr. Fine called attention to the results of a study he made that showed an expected increase in college students after the war of at least 50 per cent. He contrasted this with the statements by some college administrators that they planned to accept no more students after the war than they had previously. From this he predicted that the excess enrollment would have to be taken care of by the state and municipally supported institutions.

There were 100 persons in attendance.

JOHN S. PECK, *Secretary*

Oberlin College

During the academic year of 1944-1945 seven meetings of the Chapter were held. The subjects for discussion and the principal speakers were: "The Retirement Age in American Colleges," Mr. Donald M. Love, Secretary of the College; "The Purchasing Value of Oberlin Salaries: 1885-1945," Professor R. H. Stetson; "Bases of Promotion in Oberlin," Professor Harry N. Holmes; "The Rate of Promotion in Oberlin," Professor Forrest G. Tucker; "Universal Military Training," Dr. Ernest Hatch Wilkins, President of the College; "College Salary Scales," Dr. Elbridge P. Vance; and "The American Association of University Professors and the National Education Association," Professor Floyd S. Gove.

WARREN TAYLOR, *Retiring Secretary*

San Jose State College

Professor Ethel Sabin-Smith of Mills College spoke to the members of the newly formed chapter of San Jose State College at a meeting held on May 14. Professor Smith spoke on the purposes and functions of the Association and brought out many interesting points from a historical point of view.

Her talk also emphasized the valuable professional contributions the organization has made to college and university faculties. A former member of the Association's Council from this area, Professor Smith is exceptionally well informed concerning the work of

the Association's national committees. Her visit to the chapter was deeply appreciated.

GERTRUDE WITHERSPOON, *Secretary*

Smith College

On January 25 an interesting dinner meeting of the Smith College Chapter of the American Association of University Professors was held at the Hotel Northampton. The Chapter invited all the members of the Smith College faculty, whether or not they belonged to the Association, to attend the meeting. About 50 people were present. Professor E. C. Kirkland, Chairman of the Association's Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, spoke on the subject, "What Is the A. A. U. P.?", emphasizing particularly the work of Committee A. Questions and frank expressions of opinion followed Professor Kirkland's address. The group was especially interested in discussing the relation of the Association to colleges which have tenure plans which differ somewhat from that of the Association.

VIRGINIA CORWIN, *Secretary*

West Virginia State College

The activities of the West Virginia State College Chapter of the American Association of University Professors for the year 1944-1945 were highlighted by a definite increase in attendance at meetings and by the visit of Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, General Secretary of the Association. Special emphasis was given throughout the year to a consideration of current and crucial problems and to continued emphasis upon academic freedom and questions stemming from a consideration of the welfare of education in West Virginia. Mr. Andrew Calloway, Assistant Superintendent of Schools of Kanawha County, and Dr. I. J. K. Wells, Supervisor of Negro schools in West Virginia, were presented as speakers. In the early fall Dr. W. J. L. Wallace, representing the Chapter of the Association, appeared before the college faculty and presented the question of universal military training. After some discussion questionnaires were distributed in an effort to obtain a poll of faculty opinions. Slightly more than one-half of those who responded did not favor universal military training, one

point of objection being the assumption that it would be under the exclusive control of the armed forces.

On April 14 a dinner meeting was held honoring the presence of Dr. Ralph Himstead. In a comprehensive and inspiring address following the dinner, Dr. Himstead pointed out that the Association has the difficult task of seeking to make academic freedom a reality. He emphasized the need for more paid memberships as the Association has no subsidy but exists on dues alone. Dr. Himstead reviewed several situations illustrating the work of the Association and answered questions freely. In reply to a question the observation was made that proportionately the services of the Association's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure had been requested and given more frequently in Negro than in white colleges.

Dr. Frederick Lehner, formerly a professor at a university in Austria, reviewed an article from the Autumn, 1944 *Bulletin* on "European and American Professors." Because of his experience the review was vivid and enriched by many interesting facts concerning the European professor. At the same meeting Dr. Lulu Johnson reviewed in a capable and interesting way the article, from the same *Bulletin*, "The Association: Its Place in Higher Education."

GRACE T. WOODSON, *Secretary*

Censured Administrations

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure, endorsed by this Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Law Schools, and the American Association of Teachers Colleges.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited either upon the whole of the institution or upon the faculty but specifically upon its present administration. The term "administration" includes the administrative officers and the governing board of the institution. This censure does not affect the eligibility of nonmembers for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the date of censuring are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations:

Adelphi College, Garden City, New York (October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 494-517)	December, 1941
John B. Stetson University, De Land, Florida (October, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 377-399)	December, 1939
University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri (October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 478-493)	December, 1941
Memphis State College, Memphis, Tennessee (October, 1943 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 550-580)	April, 1944
West Chester State Teachers College West Chester, Pennsylvania (February, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 44-72)	December, 1939
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (March, 1935 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 224-266)	December, 1935
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri (December, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 514-535)	December, 1939
State Teachers College, Murfreesboro, Tennessee (December, 1942 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 662-677)	May, 1943
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee (June, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 310-319)	December, 1939
Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg, Washington (October, 1940 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 471-475)	December, 1940
Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina (April, 1942 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 173-196)	May, 1943

MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to all college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions and to graduate students and graduate assistants. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the established accrediting agencies subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership in the Association is by the Committee on Admission of Members upon nomination by one Active Member. Election takes place thirty days after the name of the nominee has been published in the *Bulletin*. The membership year in the Association is the calendar year (January 1 through December 31). The membership of nominees whose nominations are received before July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the current year. The membership of nominees whose nominations are received after July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the following year unless the nominee requests that his membership become effective as of January 1 of the current year.

The classes and conditions of membership are as follows:

Active. A person is eligible for election to Active membership if he holds a position of teaching or research with the rank of instructor or higher in an institution on the Association's eligible list, provided his work consists of at least half-time teaching or research. Annual dues are \$4.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Junior. Junior membership is open to persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions and who are not eligible for Active membership. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Associate. Associate membership is not an elective membership. Active and Junior Members whose work becomes primarily administrative are transferred to Associate membership. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Emeritus. Any member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred to Emeritus membership. Emeritus Members are exempt from dues. They may continue to receive the *Bulletin* at a special rate of \$1.00 a year.

Life Membership. The Treasurer is authorized by the Council to receive applications from members of the Association for Life membership. The rate is determined in each case on an actuarial basis and includes a life subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Continuing Eligibility. Change of occupation or transfer to an institution not on the Association's eligible list does not affect eligibility for continuance of membership.

Interruption or Termination of Membership. Interruption or termination of membership requires notification to the Association's Washington office. In the absence of such notice, membership continues with receipt of the *Bulletin* for one calendar year during which time there is an obligation to pay dues.

Nominations for Membership

The following 317 nominations for Active membership and 7 nominations for Junior membership are printed as provided by the Constitution. In accordance with action by the Council, objections to any nominee may be addressed to the General Secretary, who will in turn transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admission of Members if received within thirty days after this publication. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee any question concerning the technical eligibility of the nominee for membership as provided in the Constitution.

The Committee on Admission of Members consists of Professors Ella Lonn, Goucher College, *Chairman*; B. W. Kunkel, Lafayette College; A. Richards, University of Oklahoma; R. H. Shryock, University of Pennsylvania; W. O. Sypherd, University of Delaware; and F. J. Tschan, Pennsylvania State College.

Active

Adelphi College, Mildred Montag; **University of Akron**, Major L. Younce; **University of Alabama**, Oliver L. Lacey, Harold R. Rice; **University of Arkansas**, Grace M. Henderson; **Baylor University**, Paul S. Lavik, Gosta Rydberg; **Boston University**, Robert Campbell, George A. Cummings, Martha R. Smith;

Brown University, C. Lloyd Claff, Otto E. Neugebauer, Warren Ramsey, Paul C. Rosenbloom, Bessie H. Rudd, Philip Taft, Arthur O. Williams, Jr.; **Bucknell University**, Loren S. Hadley, Meyer F. Nimkoff; **University of Buffalo**, Claude E. Puffer; **University of California**, Alan R. Thompson; **Centenary College of Louisiana**, Amanda Wilson; **University of Cincinnati**, Alfred K. George, Eleanor R. Maclay; **Clarkson College of Technology**, Fred F. Piper; **University of Colorado**, Ruth Blair, Carl W. Borgmann, Calvin Grieder, H. Harold Kelley, Marie A. Mehl, Mehdi Nakosteen, Edwin R. Walker; **Columbia University**, Clarence H. Graham, Dewey H. Palmer, Mario A. Pei; **Connecticut College**, Catherine Wolkonsky; **Teachers College of Connecticut**, Paul N. Wenger; **University of Connecticut**, Frank H. Ash; **Dartmouth College**, Willis M. Rayton; **University of Delaware**, Walther Kirchner; **De Paul University**, Charles R. Williams; **Evansville College**, Shirley Snethen; **Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College**, L. Beatrice Clarke, George W. Conoly, H. Manning Efferson, Alonzo S. Gaither, W. H. Hollins, E. L. King, Charity M. Mance, A. S. Parks, A. W. Shute, William H. Smith, Jr., E. P. Southhall, John C. Tinner, Ethan E. Ware, Genevieve J. Wheeler; **George Peabody College for Teachers**, Susan B. Riley; **Georgia School of Technology**, Henry L. Edwards; **Georgia State College for Women**, George W. Beiswanger; **Hampton Institute**, Paul E. Baker, Marian P. Capps, Anne M. Cooke, William F. Goins, Jr., Jessie Lemon, Karla Longrée, J. Saunders Redding; **Harvard University**, Charles R. Cherington; **University of Hawaii**, Robert C. Lindner, Raymond E. Murphy; **Heidelberg College**, John W. Fausey, Forrest M. Keen, Frank R. Kramer, Howard E. Menke, Allen O. Miller; **Hofstra College**, John B. Haney, Marcus C. Old, John A. Smith, E. Russell Stabler; **Hollins College**, Janet L. MacDonald; **Hunter College**, Helen Johnston; **Southern Illinois Normal University**, Elizabeth C. Meehan, Shelby S. Shake; **Illinois State Normal University**, Neal E. Glenn, Harlan W. Peithman; **University of Illinois**, Glenn M. Blair; **Indiana State Teachers College**, Wayne E. Schomer; **Iowa State College**, Mildred Barr, Lester Blum, Oswald H. Brownlee, Florence A. Ehrenkranz, Eric B. Fowler, Kenneth L. Johnson, George W. Snedecor, William J. Tudor, Charles W. Turner, Wallace Wright; **University of Iowa**, Lauren A. Van Dyke; **James Millikin University**, Flora Ross; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Adele M. Burnett; **Kemper Military School**, Charles W. Kern; **Lafayette College**, Herbert W. Starr; **Lawrence College**, Anselm Strauss; **Limestone College**, John W. Eberly; **Northwestern State College of Louisiana**, John S. Kyser; **Louisiana State University**, Raphael Levy, Robert H. Wilson; **Louisiana State University (Northeast Junior College)**, John C. Currie; **Loyola University (Illinois)**, Theodosi Mogilnitsky; **Madison College**, Kathryn C. Tully; **University of Maine**, Ronald B. Levinson; **Manhattan College**, Arthur B. Kemper; **Massachusetts State College**, Clifford V. Kightlinger; **Meharry Medical College**, Clifton Dummett, Marion E. Zealey; **Michigan State College**, Walter Firey; **University of Michigan**, Charles N. Davison; **Middlebury College**, Richard L. Brown, Reginald L. Cook, Harry M. Fife, Burt A. Hazeltine, Waldo H. Heinrichs, A. John Holden, Jr., Clara B. Knapp, Rose E. Martin, J. S. Prentice, Mary S. Rosevear,

Benjamin F. Wissler; Milwaukee-Downer College, Dorothy Dart, Grace E. Moore; Northern Montana College, Gladys Bookman; University of Montreal, Gerard Gardner; University of Nebraska, Myron J. Roberts; University of Nevada, Frederick L. Bixby; New York State Teachers College (Buffalo), Alfred Holman, Jr.; New York University, Theodore Lang; North Carolina College for Negroes, C. Ruth Edwards, Charles L. Holmes, James S. Lee, LeRoy T. Walker; Northeastern University, Gustave Serino; Northwestern University, Irving Pflaum; University of Notre Dame, Francis L. Benton, Salvator D. Bernardi, Kenneth N. Campbell, Robert F. Ervin, William H. Hamill, Louis Hasley, Ferdinand A. Hermens, Theodor K. Just, Earl F. Langwell, Murray Mannos, Joseph P. Mullally, Raymond V. Pence, Donald J. Plunkett, James A. Reyniers, Walter L. Shilts, Richard Sullivan, Philip C. Trexler, George J. Wack; Occidental College, William C. Kauffman, Elsie M. Smithies; Ohio State University, Alan F. Griffin; Southeastern State College (Oklahoma), Robert W. Frazier; University of Oklahoma, Edward C. Mason, John H. Rohrer; University of Oregon, Percy M. Collier; Pennsylvania State College, Edwin J. Anderson, Harry A. Baumann, Samuel P. Bayard, Harry N. Benkert, Alden B. Bestul, Luther T. Bissey, Raymond R. Bloom, R. Wallace Brewster, H. Beecher Charnbury, Lynn Christy, Benn E. Clouser, Ray M. Conger, Carl E. Drumheller, Ellsworth C. Dunkle, Jr., Earle L. Edwards, Richard B. Fox, David J. Gildea, Phyllis R. Griess, William Gutteron, Marie Haidt, William F. Hall, George W. Harvey, Fred J. Holben, Mamie R. Hoover, Herbert Insley, Charles D. Jeffries, Pauline E. Keeney, Edward Kelly, Everett A. Keyes, Paul D. Krynine, Martin S. McAndrews, Everett McLaughlin, Frederick B. Marbut, Albert P. Michaels, David R. Mitchell, Earle E. Muschlitz, Jr., Howard B. Musser, William M. Myers, Hans Neuberger, Ralph F. Nielsen, Wesley L. Nyborg, Lawrence Perez, Richard C. Raymond, Anthony C. Richer, John Y. Roy, Robert B. Rutherford, John S. Saby, Paul H. Schweitzer, Benjamin L. Seem, Joseph C. Sherrill, Theodore S. Spicer, Hugh E. Spittal, Margaret R. Swartz, Robert K. Vierck, Cyrus A. Weisgerber, Elliot L. Whitaker, Eleanor L. Willis, Guy Woods, Howard R. Yeager, S. T. Yuster, Samuel Zerfoss; Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Indiana), Norah E. Zink; University of Pennsylvania, Arthur C. Bining, Samuel Gurin, Arthur P. Whitaker; Phillips University, T. F. Watson; Pomona College, Orville G. Harrold, Jr.; Prairie View State College, John H. Windom; Princeton University, Gregory P. Tschebotarioff; University of Puerto Rico, Joseph Kavetsky, Ruth E. Newman, Oscar E. Porrata, George R. Warrek; Purdue University, J. Norman Arnold; Queens College (New York), Boris Schwarz; Rhode Island State College, Frank L. Howard; Rice Institute, Joseph D. Thomas; Ripon College, Van V. Alderman; Rutgers University, Donald C. Dorian, Joseph M. Ginsburg, Harold S. Grant, Margaret A. Judson, William J. Norton, Robert L. Starkey, Leslie A. Stauber; St. John's University, Frank T. Molony; Seton Hall College, Victor J. DiFlippo; Stanford University, Quinn McNemar; Syracuse University, O. Richard Wessels; Temple University, Gordon F. Hostettler, Leslie W. Kindred; Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, Guy W. Adriance, O. F. Allen, Paul S. Ballance,

Fred R. Brison, A. L. Darnell, Robert K. Fletcher, Edmund C. Klipple, J. G. McGuire, Edward D. Parnell, Carl E. Sandstedt, Esther Taubenhause, Thomas H. Terrell; **Texas College of Arts and Industries**, Georgia W. Bergeron, Loyd Douglas, Dorothy Gaston, George W. McCulley, Otto R. Nielsen, Jeff D. Smith, W. A. Rasco; **East Texas State Teachers College**, Elizabeth Henderson, Thomas H. Brady, Elizabeth Huggins, Clydine Stickney, Gilbert R. Waller; **Texas Technological College**, Edith G. Coleman; **University of Texas**, Donald S. Strong; **University of Toledo**, Herbert Schering; **United States Naval Academy**, Byron Cosby, Jr.; **Ursinus College**, Calvin D. Yost, Jr.; **Utah State Agricultural College**, George T. Blanch, Theodore W. Daniel, Ina Doty, Calvin Fletcher, Jessie Larson, Cleve H. Milligan, William E. Mortimer, Everett C. Thorpe, Clara P. West; **University of Utah**, Anna M. Driscoll; **Vassar College**, Alfred Romer; **Virginia State College**, Camilla L. Howard; **University of Virginia**, Chauncey McL. Gilbert, Richard L. Shoemaker; **Wabash College**, James I. Osborne; **University of Washington**, Herbert Boehmer, Grant I. Butterbaugh, Judson F. Falknor, Bertha M. Kuhn, Martha J. Nix, Mary S. Tschudin, Gertrude Wulfekoetter; **West Virginia State College**, Joseph W. Grider, Grace C. Sherman; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (River Falls)**, Ingwelde Pfizner; **University of Wisconsin**, Flora Hanning, Roe-Merrill S. Heffner, O. Sidney Orth; **Yale University**, Marshall Bartholomew, Charles L. Clark, Boris Garfinkel.

Junior

University of Missouri, John E. McAdam; **University of North Carolina**, Hanford M. Henderson; **University of Notre Dame**, Paul S. Stokely; **University of Texas**, June Hyer; **Not in Accredited Institutional Connection**, Ira C. Ihde (M.A., **University of Kansas**), Portales, N. Mex.; B. Paul Ross (Ed.D., **Pennsylvania State College**), Phillipi, W. Va.; Morrison Sharp (Ph.D., **Harvard University**), Ashland, Wis.

Members Elected

The Committee on Admissions of Members announces the election of 388 Active and 14 Junior Members as follows:

Active

Agnes Scott College, Henry C. Forman, Margaret G. Trotter; **University of Akron**, Joanna Alogdelis; **Alabama College**, Bernice R. Finger, Honor M. Winer; **University of Alaska**, Basil M. Bensin; **Albion College**, Mary E. McKinney; **Allegheny College**, Jane A. Marker, Emma S. Phelps; **Amherst College**, Reuben A. Brower; **University of Arizona**, Frederick J. Schmitz; **University of Arkansas**, Otis T. Osgood; **Baylor University**, Phil H. Hidy, Cornelia M. Smith; **Beloit College**, Andrew H. Whiteford, René de V. Williamson; **Berea College**, Wilmot Carter; **Boston University**, Harold M. Bowman, Joseph G. Brin, Max Davis, A. Lawrence MacKenzie; **Bowling Green**

State University, Maude E. Doane, Elsie Lorenz; **Brooklyn College**, Samuel J. Hurwitz; **Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn**, William L. Parker; **Brown University**, Samuel Lerner, J. Walter Wilson; **Butler University**, Philip M. Bail, Elizabeth B. Ward; **University of California (Los Angeles)**, J. A. C. Grant, Jorgen Holmboe, Elly M. Jacobsen, Kenneth G. Kingrey, Cristel B. Schomaker; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, José B. Alemany, Grace E. Patterson, Helen J. Topp; **Catawba College**, Charles H. Douglas, Charles D. Howell; **Centre College**, Laura Robinson; **University of Chicago**, Wilbur L. Beauchamp, Weldon G. Brown, Virgil E. Herrick; **University of Cincinnati**, Joseph E. Holliday, Melrose Pitman; **The City College (New York)**, William Neidlinger, Harold H. Roth; **The City College (Commerce Center)**, Austin J. O'Leary, Norman J. Powell; **Coe College**, Betty J. Eilertsen; **Colgate University**, Charles N. Schirone; **Western State College of Colorado**, Pauline F. Costa; **University of Colorado**, Gordon H. Barker, Minnie G. Berueffy, Harriet Jeffery; **Columbia University**, Jacques Barzun, Clifford Brownell, R. Freeman Butts, Max Horkheimer, Vernon Loggins; **Connecticut College**, Frances S. Brett, Bianco M. Calabresi, Hazel A. Johnson, Marion Leonard, Edwin L. Minar, Jr., Hannah G. Roach, Jane Worthington; **Teachers College of Connecticut**, William C. Lee; **University of Connecticut**, G. C. Graf, Rufus I. Munsell, Helen M. Roberts; **Cornell College**, Laura J. J. Brooks, Marian L. Pitt; **Cornell University**, William R. Irwin; **University of Dayton**, James M. Manfredini; **De Paul University**, William T. Powers; **University of Detroit**, Oscar C. Schnicker; **Drury College**, William D. Burbank; **Duke University**, Herbert von Beckerath, Elizabeth R. Sunderland; **Elmira College**, Hans H. Bernt, Helen H. Bjorvand, Horace S. Merrill, Mary C. Suffa; **Florida State College for Women**, Ramona C. Beard; **University of Florida**, Biron H. Walker; **Fresno State College**, Gertrude S. Billard, Betty A. Henderson, Charles H. Quibell; **Georgia School of Technology**, Lawrence V. Johnson, Horace W. Sturgis, George K. Williams; **University of Georgia**, Charles W. Hock, Sam A. Singal; **Gettysburg College**, Myron L. Simpson; **Hamilton College**, Nelson C. Dale; **Hampton Institute**, Paul E. Drost; **Harvard University**, Raphael Demos, Hugh M. Raup; **University of Hawaii**, A. Grove Day, Harvey I. Fisher, Floyd W. Hartmann; **Hofstra College**, Kermit L. Kuntz; **Hunter College**, Natale Colosi, Nancy M. Ferguson; **University of Idaho**, Virgil R. Baker, William Banks, Harry C. Harmsworth, Kenneth Hoag; **Southern Illinois Normal University**, Esther M. Shubert; **Illinois State Normal University**, Lucile Klauser; **University of Illinois**, Irwin A. Berg, Anna F. Oder; **Indiana State Teachers College**, Celeste Burgeson, Glenn M. Curtis, Mary O. Peters, Bernardine G. Schmidt; **Iowa State College**, Theodore A. Bancroft, Irene H. Buchanan, Elisabeth A. Curtiss, Elroy M. Gladrow, Anita M. Kezer, Marvin N. Olsen, Aldor Peterson, Robert E. Rundle, Lenore M. Sullivan, Edith M. Sunderlin, Lydia V. Swanson, Edward H. Winger; **State University of Iowa**, Paul J. Blommers, Huber O. Croft, Samuel R. Harding, George Heather; **Fort Hays Kansas State College**, Clarice Short; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)**, Esby C. McGill; **University of Kansas**, Laurel Anderson; **University of Kansas City**, George F. Kneller;

Kent State University, George R. Bach; Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College, Lorrin G. Kennamer; Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery, George E. Snyder; Knox College, Mark Biddle; Laval University, Henri Ouellet; Lawrence College, George Leedham, William R. Ward; Limestone College, John H. Wolfe; Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Philip W. Rivers; Louisiana State University, Andrew C. Albrecht, George C. Kent, Jr., John P. Mixner, Milton A. Reilly, Frank A. Rickey; University of Maine, Richard K. Stuart; Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, Mary F. Goffin, Mary D. Kirby, Anita Yannitelli; Marshall College, Marius Blesi, William H. Childs, George W. Howgate, Virginia Lee, Lee A. Wolfard; Western Maryland College, John D. Makosky; University of Maryland, Marie D. Bryan; Massachusetts State College, Richard W. Fessenden; University of Miami, Taylor R. Alexander, John L. Rouse; Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Fred Hanselmann, William A. Longacre, F. L. Partlo, Sherwood R. Price, Ella L. Wood; Michigan State College, Richard M. Dorson, Leo A. Haak, John B. Holland, Chester A. Lawson, Charles P. Loomis, Verne Powers; Michigan State Normal College, Mary R. Martin; University of Michigan, Richard H. Fogle, Aarre K. Lahti, James D. Prendergast, Alexander H. Smith, Clyde Vroman, Merwin H. Waterman, Carlton F. Wells, Joseph K. Yamagiwa; Minnesota State Teachers College (Duluth), Lawrence M. Hahn, Roger J. Hargrave, Madelyn A. Kleutsch, Taimi M. Ranta, Lillian R. Wagner; University of Missouri, Virginia Bryant, Ethel A. Mitchell; Montana State University, Edwin W. Briggs, Robert T. Turner; Morningside College, Arthur P. Becker; Muskingum College, John H. Bloom, Charles D. Morehead; University of Nebraska, T. T. Aakhus, James S. Blackman, Eliza E. Gamble, L. E. Hanson, E. Joseph Marmo, John H. Paustian, Jeannette F. Shotwell, Linus B. Smith; New Jersey State Teachers College (Jersey City), Carl W. Barget; New York State College for Teachers, Louise Jewett, Perry D. Westbrook; New York State Teachers College (Buffalo), Ruth Palmer, Paul W. Sloan, Kate V. Wofford; New York State Teachers College (Cortland), Minnie P. Carr; New York State Teachers College (Oswego), Eric Brunger, Irene Eisele, Isabelle K. Hart, Hester Hoffman, William G. McGarvey, Marion E. Mahar, Marietta Odell, W. Seward Salisbury, Donald Snygg, Lloyd F. Sunderman, Charles S. Turner, Jr., Charles F. Wells, Matilda Wordelman, Charles B. Yager; New York University, A. William Salomone; North Carolina College for Negroes, Diana S. Dent, Isador Oglesby, Carroll T. Willis; North Carolina State College, Selz C. Mayo, Ross Shumaker; East Carolina Teachers College (North Carolina), Preston W. Edsall, Lena C. Ellis; Northwestern University, Hermanus T. Baer, Malcolm T. MacEachern; Norwich University, N. Richard Butler; University of Notre Dame, Carson P. Buck, C. Robert Egly, Noe Higinbotham, John D. Mizelle, Philip H. Riley, William F. Roemer, Robert E. Tschan; Oberlin College, Louis D. Rodabaugh; Ohio University, Elizabeth G. Andersch; Ohio Wesleyan University, Eugene V. McFarland, Schuyler F. Otteson; Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Berlin B. Chapman, Katharine W. Kumler, Yvonne Tait; Northwestern State College

(Oklahoma), John B. Stout; **University of Oklahoma**, Isidore Budick, John B. Thompson; **Eastern Oregon College of Education**, Mabel J. Hawkinson, Lucas F. Sterne; **Pennsylvania College for Women**, Phyllis M. Ferguson; **Pennsylvania State College**, Donald C. Fuller, William U. Snyder; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Clarion)**, Helen M. Barton, Margaret A. Boyd; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Lock Haven)**, Charlotte Smith; **University of Pennsylvania**, George D. Gammon, Donald N. Koster; **Phoenix Junior College**, Carl J. Newnam; **University of Pittsburgh**, Alexander J. Allen, Claire A. Anderson, Asher Isaacs, William C. Kelly, Catherine E. Reiser, R. E. Sherrill, William F. Swanson, Robert L. Zetler; **Princeton University**, Arthur L. Bigelow, David F. Bowers, F. Leicester Cuthbert, Josef M. Jauch, William J. McKeefery, Charles T. Murphy, Ernst Snapper, Hans F. Winterkorn; **The Principia**, Marjorie E. Mathews; **University of Puerto Rico**, Ramón Ramirez-López, Julió Sellés-Sóla; **Purdue University**, Nathan Kornblum, Ernest C. Young; **Queens College (New York)**, Dolores De C. Weast; **University of Rochester**, Harold F. Bright; **Rutgers University**, Anna S. Starr; **St. Lawrence University**, Andreas Dorpalen; **St. Louis University**, Walter J. Kramer; **Salem College**, Evabelle S. Covington; **San Jose State College**, Joyce Backus, Martha E. Thomas; **Colleges of the Seneca**, J. Orvin Mundt, Otto E. Schoen-René; **University of South Carolina**, Samuel M. Derrick, McFerron C. Gittinger, Wasley S. Krogdahl, C. Eucebia Shuler; **University of Southern California**, Frederick R. Hirsh, Jr.; **Southwestern University**, Arthur W. Jones; **Stowe Teachers College**, Herman Dreer; **Sweet Briar College**, Gladys Boone, Helen S. Pollock; **Syracuse University**, Paul J. Sedgwick, Robert Shafer; **Talladega College**, Butler A. Jones; **Tennessee Polytechnic Institute**, Willie C. W. Partin; **Texas College of Arts and Industries**, Frances Alexander, Mamie E. Brown, Johnnie Mae deM. Haun, Elizabeth A. Oliphant, Jennie L. Splawn; **Texas State College for Women**, Esther L. Mueller; **East Texas State Teachers College**, Mary Few, Margaret McGill, Claude H. Thurman; **Texas Technological College**, Horace E. Woodward; **University of Texas**, James M. Hurt, Jack Lenhart; **Tufts College**, David A. Fisher, Murray E. Othmer; **Tulane University**, B. Jean Griffith; **United States Naval Academy**, Arthur S. Curtis; **Utah State Agricultural College**, Thelma Fogelberg, Sherwin Maeser, Esther L. Skeels; **University of Utah**, Arthur A. Center, George S. Dibble, Clarence R. Mott, Angus M. Woodbury; **Vassar College**, Gertrude Bohm, William D. Denny, Mary S. Fisher, Charles C. Griffin, Elyot Henderson, Mary Hillis, Edna C. Macmahon, Margarita de Mayo, Eveline B. Omwake, Ralph S. Palmer, Mildred D. Southwick; **Medical College of Virginia**, Robert W. Ramsey; **Virginia Union University**, William J. Goodwin; **University of Virginia (Mary Washington College)**, Charlotte Klein, Esmond L. Marilla; **Eastern Washington College of Education**, Charlotte C. Lang, Omer Pence, Mary G. Swerer, Nan K. Wiley; **Western Washington College of Education**, Frank L. D'Andrea; **State College of Washington**, Stanley P. Swenson; **University of Washington**, August A. Auernheimer, Stephen D. Brown, John A. Conway, Carl S. Dakan, Hope L. Foote, Henry M. Foster, Edward C.

Lingafelter, Bryan T. McMinn, Caswell A. Mills, G. Spencer Reeves, Sergius Sergev, Theodore Thayer, William H. Thwing, Robert B. Van Horn, Margaret C. Walters; **Wayne University**, James M. Orten; **Western Reserve University**, Kenneth Lawyer, David H. Roberts; **Wilberforce University**, Milton S. J. Wright; **College of William and Mary**, W. Wallace McCormick; **Winthrop College**, Allen D. Edwards; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (La Crosse)**, Harold M. Skadeland; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (River Falls)**, Elsie S. Hoffmann, Lillian R. Hoffmann, B. H. Kettelkamp, Maud A. Latta, Vera Moss, Walker D. Wyman; **University of Wisconsin**, Richard H. Bruck, John H. Lilly, Leonard A. Salter, Jr., John F. Stauffer, Jr.; **University of Wyoming**, Bernice Udick, Georges Vedier; **Yale University**, Myres S. McDougal, Roscoe T. Steffen.

Transfers from Junior to Active

Denison University, Robert H. Irrman; **Wake Forest College**, Henry L. Snuggs.

Junior

University of Hawaii, Isabella A. Abbott, Yoshinori Tanada; **Iowa State College**, Carl E. Langenhop; **University of Missouri**, Earl C. Cunningham, Gilbert R. Dale; **University of Oklahoma**, Betty D. Evans; **Pennsylvania State College**, Lucy Clayton; **Vassar College**, Anne Milman; **University of Washington**, Stephen C. Clark, III; **Not in Accredited Institutional Connection**, Charles T. Gabriele (M.A., New York University), Brooklyn, N. Y.; Luella Madden (M.A., Columbia University), Portales, N. Mex.; Thelma Mallory (M.A., Colorado State College of Education), Portales, N. Mex.; Robert H. Shaw (A.M., University of Wisconsin), Arlington, Va.; Anna K. Wilton (M.A., University of New Mexico), Portales, N. Mex.

Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

To assist in the placement of college and university teachers the American Association of University Professors publishes notices of academic vacancies and of teachers available. It is optional with appointing officers and teachers to publish their names and addresses or to use key numbers. If a key number is used those interested should address letters of inquiry for forwarding in care of the General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Vacancies Reported

- Medical Bacteriologist: for teaching and research. Class A medical school, east. Ph.D. or M.D. required. State qualifications and experience. V 1129
- Political Science and History: Instructor or Assistant Professor, southern woman's college. Man or woman, age 28-40. Ph.D. preferred, some teaching experience. Salary range: living and \$1200-\$1800. V 1130

Teachers Available

- Accounting and Business Administration: Man, 41, A.B., M.A., R.A. Full and practical knowledge of accounting principles, cost accounting, auditing, governmental accounting, business organization and corporate finance. Successful teaching experience in this field. Diversified, cultural background of liberal arts and travel. Available now. A 2258
- Biologist, Zoologist: Undergraduate and three years of graduate work all at leading universities. 19 years of college teaching, mostly zoology, genetics and physiology in western state university. Publications. Stress personal relationship to students. Protestant. A 2259
- Biology and Zoology: Man, 34, married, 2 children. Ph.D. Honor societies, publications. 9 years' college teaching experience in present position. General biology, general zoology, histology, embryology, genetics, anatomy, and physiology. Experienced in teaching anatomy and physiology in nursing school as well. At present an associate professor. Desires change, teaching or administrative, in a recognized college or university. A 2260
- Biology (Botany, Zoology, Entomology): Man, 43, married, 2 children. B.S. and doctorate at leading universities, research-minded. Experience includes 15 years' university and college teaching. Wishes to change present permanent position for one with greater opportunities, such as department chairmanship. East preferred. A 2261
- Chemistry: Man, 33, married, Ph.D. Physico-organic chemist, 8 years' teaching experience, 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ years N.D.R.C. Publications including book. Phi Lambda Upsilon and Sigma Xi. Desires position in accredited university which fosters research and provides a stimulating research atmosphere where there is opportunity to teach advanced courses. A 2262
- Chemistry: Teaching with research or department headship. Ph.D. 10 years' successful college teaching and industrial research, analytical, inorganic, photochemistry and electrochemistry. Publications, honorary and professional societies. A 2263

Chemistry: Man, married, 3 children. Ph.D. 7 years' successful teaching as college professor and in U. S. Army. Specialties are analytical and general chemistry and bacteriology. Also 8 years' experience as food and drug chemist. Research publications. Sigma Xi, American Chemical Society. Available within 30 days. A 2294

Chemistry and Chemical Engineering: Man, 31. B.S. chemical engineering, M.S. and Ph.D. petroleum engineering, 1942. Engaged 1942 to present in development and field testing of war devices. Desires full-time teaching or teaching and research. Prefers to locate Rocky Mountain area or west of New England. A 2264

Dean of Instruction or Teacher of Psychology: Man, married, Ph.D., Columbia; major, psychology; minor, sociology; teacher for thirteen years in the social sciences; travel in Central America, Europe and the Orient; member of Phi Delta Kappa, Virginia Academy of Science and American Association of University Professors. A 2265

Economics (specializing in personnel and labor problems): Extensive college teaching and government experience. M.A., Columbia. Completing Ph.D. dissertation. A 2266

Economics: Man, 40, married, Ph.D., 15 years' experience, college and university teaching, government employment and research, available for temporary or permanent position. A 2267

Economics (specializing in Economic History, Labor, Government and Business): Man, 34, Ph.D. 1939. 7 years' university teaching experience, 3 years in government, largely economic research. Publications and subsidized research program. Desire university position permitting some specialization in economic history. A 2268

Economics and Government: Woman, Ph.D., 18 years' college teaching experience, foreign study and research. Available for college teaching or research. A 2269

Education: Man, 42, married, 2 daughters, Ed.D. state university; major, educational administration; minors, curriculum and instruction, and educational psychology. 20 years' teaching experience. 15 years' administration in public schools and 5 years' college teaching. Would consider administrative duties. Available for academic year 1945-46. A 2270

English: Man, 53, married. Ph.D. Columbia, 1925. Listed in *Who's Who in America and Directory of American Scholars*. 23 years' college teaching: Dartmouth, Syracuse, and Sewanee. 16 years full professor, head of department, and for same period editor of well-known literary quarterly. Visiting Carnegie Professor to British universities (Manchester, Liverpool, and Aberdeen), 1935. Editor and author: new book now in press for publication spring, 1946. Consider professorship in liberal arts college or in university undergraduate and/or graduate department. A 2271

English: Man, 35, married. Ph.D. 7 years' college and university teaching, editing and administrative experience. Scholarly and general publications. Φ B K. Soon to be honorably discharged from Army. Desire appointment second semester and summer before returning to assistant professorship, leading college from which on leave. Would consider permanent appointment with promotion. A 2272

English: Woman, Ph.D. and post-doctorate work. 7 years of university teaching. Library training and experience. Interests: Elizabethan poetry and drama; contemporary poetry and drama, American, British, and Continental; Arthurian romance; versification; creative writing; bibliography. Could direct a writers' conference. A 2273

English: Man, 41, Ph.D. 15 years' college experience. Resigned professorship to accept South American cultural relations post, Department of State. Now holding responsible government public relations position, Washington, D. C. Numerous published articles, textbooks. Major interests, modern novel and drama. Available on short notice. A 2274

English: Man, 34, married, 2 children, Protestant. Ph.D. Successful teaching and administrative experience, expert in veterans' affairs and counseling. MLA, NCTE, etc. Numerous publications. Specializes in American literature, Milton. Interested in research and administration as well as teaching. A 2275

French: Man, 35, married. Doctorate, publications. Formerly associate professor at state university. Now in war-related work, though position permanent. Wishes to return to teaching. Desires associate or full professorship. A 2276

Geology: Man, Ph.D., 21 years' diversified college teaching experience, extensive field work and travel. Prefers either coast or Gulf west. Sigma Xi, professional societies. A 2277

History: Man, 48. Ph.D. 18 years' teaching experience, in two colleges, in every field of history. Experience also in European governments, international relations, and political theory. Author of two books, one a textbook in the history of civilization. Desires position as director of a course in the history of civilization or a professorship of European history in a first-class college or university. A 2278

History and Political Science: Man, married, children, Ph.D. Present position: professor of history at eastern college. 15 years' teaching experience at European universities and in U. S. Field of special interest: Central European and Balkan history. Publications, extensive travel. Available February, 1946. A 2279

Industrial Engineering: Ph.D. with European degrees and experience in applied psychology, executive and foremanship training, personnel, job analysis, motion and time study, management, supervision and production teaching. 32 publications. Wants professorship with research possibilities to finish Industrial Engineering Dictionary work. A 2280

Journalism: Man, 41, married, B.S., M.S. 7 years' newspaper, publicity, and other journalistic experience; 7 years' university teaching. Publications. Special field: editorial techniques. Excellent references. Desire associate professorship or full professorship. Northern location preferred. Available January 1, 1946. A 2295

Languages: Man, 31, married, one child. M.A. and Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania. Φ B K. Several years' experience teaching romance languages; acting head of department. Two years' experience in government work. Travel and study abroad. Prefers to teach French; will also teach Spanish, Portuguese, or Italian. A 2281

Modern Languages (Spanish, French, German), Latin, Comparative Linguistics: Man, married, Ph.D. College teaching experience, extensive travel. Desires position in recognized college. Immediately available. A 2282

Modern Languages, Comparative Linguistics and Literature: Woman, Ph.D., studied in European and American universities, including recent visiting scholarships at Yale and Columbia. 13 years' college teaching experience as professor of German, extensive travel, publications. Present position, specialized research in government agency. Prefer teaching position should suitable opening present itself. A 2283

Physical Education, Health, Recreation: Man, 46, married, Ph.D. Elementary, high school, college and university teaching and supervision and administration experience. Professor, undergraduate and graduate teacher training majors. Seeks permanent position with tenure in college or university. Qualified for

- administrative duties. Publications. Phi Delta Kappa, Phi Epsilon Kappa. Listed in *Leaders in Education* and *Who's Who in American Education*. A 2284
- Physical Education, Hygiene: Ph.D. Iowa. 14 years' college and university experience. Supervisory and administrative experience. Interested in teacher training or in teaching hygiene. Professorship or department head desired. Available January or September, 1946. A 2296
- Physics: Man, 35, married, 1 child. Ph.D. University of Chicago. 2 years' teaching experience, 4 years' experimental work in radio, 1 year experience in nuclear physics. Desires change from present consulting job to preferably research or teaching position. A 2298
- Political Science: LL.M., Ph.D. 15 years' teaching experience. Subjects taught: international law and organization, international relations, American government. Author of work on comparative law and of articles in leading periodicals. Widely traveled. Now in government work, desires return to academic field. Available now. A 2285
- Political Science, Economics, History: Man, married. Universities in Germany and Switzerland, 2 Ph.D.'s, 3 years' teaching in German, 7 years' teaching in American colleges. Teaching includes wide range of political science and some economics and history subjects. Languages, research, publications, travel abroad. Preference for international organization, European and American government, political philosophy, seeks permanent position. A 2286
- Political Science: Man, 45, married, one child, LL.M. Harvard. 14 years' teaching experience at eastern college. Textbook in American Political Parties. Preference for that subject, constitutional law, international law, and similar subjects. Seven law review articles. Four years' practice with leading law firms. A 2287
- Psychology (Statistics, Tests and Measurements, Personnel): Man, 41, Ph.D. Teaching experience in two leading universities. Conducted research on psychological tests, criteria, industrial psychology, and statistical methods in government and industry. Editor of psychological journal; past officer of several psychological societies. Directed N.D.R.C. war project. Many publications. Excellent teacher and speaker with both theoretical and applied background. Now engaged in an industry-wide research program. Desires university teaching position. Available on reasonable notice. A 2288
- Psychology: Man, married, Ph.D., major in psychology, minor in education. 14 years' experience teaching at secondary level, 7 years' at college level. Journal and book publications. Desires permanent position in college or teachers college where there is opportunity for advancement. A 2289
- Psychology (specialization in Clinical and Abnormal Psychology, Mental Hygiene, Psychological Testing and Psychodiagnostic Methods): Man, 37, married, Ph.D. Experience includes 6 years' university teaching, 4 years' full-time clinical work and 4 years' military service as naval Lieutenant Commander. Publications; Sigma Xi; professional organizations; Fellow of Rorschach Institute. On military leave from large eastern university. Desires permanent position in university offering professional advancement. Available December, 1945, possibly sooner. A 2290
- Psychology, Languages: Man, 38, single, Ph.D. degree from large state university. 12 years' university teaching experience. Good references. Psychology: special interest in psychology of language, thought, and learning. Languages: methodology, phonetics; in order of preference—Russian (excellent); Spanish (bilingual); French. A 2291
- Sociology: Man, 43, married, 1 child. A.B. Dartmouth, A.M. and Ph.D. Columbia; 17 years' college teaching. Has taught wide variety of courses in sociology. Special fields of interest and qualification, The Family and Minority Groups.

Research and community organization experience. European travel experience. Desires teaching or research position, or combination of both. Available September, 1945 or thereafter. A 2292

Sociology or Administration: Man, 46, married. B.Sc., M.A., Ph.D. leading eastern university. Ex-Fellow, Social Science Research Council. 14 years' successful teaching experience; 6 as full professor eastern university. 3 years' research. Author 10 books, 50 articles in leading social science journals here and abroad. Widely considered in U. S. A. and abroad as leading authority in his special field. In World War II Army officer, field grade. Also administrative experience in headquarters Washington governmental agency. Extensive foreign travel and research. Available summer, 1946. A 2297

Sociology, Political Science, Political and Economic Geography: Man, 45, Ph.D. Wants position in an institution with high scholastic standards where responsibility is commensurate with professional standing. A 2293



Founded in 1918 by
Carnegie Corporation of New York

to
pool the funding of college retirement plans
offers

Individual Life Insurance
Collective Life Insurance
Annuity Contracts

TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION

A non-profit, legal reserve life insurance company
522 Fifth Avenue New York 18, N. Y.